STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
3 0144 00406785 6

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/vol8studiesineng00stud

STUDIES IN ENGLISH

NUMBER 8

University of Texas Bulletin

No. 2826: July 8, 1928

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY FOUR TIMES A MONTH, AND ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER AT THE POSTOFFICE AT AUSTIN, TEXAS, UNDER THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912

The benefits of education and of useful knowledge, generally diffused through a community, are essential to the preservation of a free government.

Sam Houston

Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. . . . It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge and the only security that freemen desire.

Mirabeau B. Lamar

CONTENTS

PAGE

RECENT WORKS IN THE FIELD OF ENGLISH LINGUISTICS, by Morgan Callaway, Jr. 5

THE FIRST BRITISH COLONIZATION OF BRITTANY, by Clark Harris Slover 42

A STYLISTIC DEVICE OF THE SAGAS INVOLVING THE SYNTAX OF THE SUPERLATIVE IN OLD NORSE, by Jess H. Jackson 50

ELIZABETH AS EUPHUIST BEFORE "EUPHUES," by Theodore Stenberg 65

THE VERSION OF THE BIBLE USED BY PEELE IN THE COMPOSITION OF "DAVID AND BETHSABE," by Arthur M. Sampley 79

MILTON'S CONCEPTION OF SAMSON, by Evert Mordecai Clark 88

MORE ABOUT DRYDEN AS AN ADAPTER OF SHAKESPEARE, by D. T. Starnes 100

WHO WAS "OUTIS"? by Killis Campbell 107

SOME NINETEENTH CENTURY CRITICS OF REALISM, by Houghton W. Taylor 110

243313

PENNSYLVANIA
STATE LIBRARY

RECENT WORKS IN THE FIELD OF ENGLISH LINGUISTICS (1921–1927)

By Morgan Callaway, Jr.

Two invaluable surveys of English linguistics have appeared within the last four years. The first, entitled *Englische Sprachkunde,* by Dr. Johannes Hoops, Professor of English in the University of Heidelberg, was published in 1923, at Stuttgart-Gotha, being the ninth volume in the series of *Wissenschaftliche Forschungsberichte* edited by Professor Karl Hönn. This monograph of 127 pages names and evaluates the most noteworthy works in the field of English linguistics appearing during the years 1914 through 1920, especially those that were produced in Germany. The second survey, "Die Englische Sprachwissenschaft," by Professor Wilhelm Horn, of the University of Giessen, appeared a year later in *Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft, Festschrift für Wilhelm Streitberg* (Heidelberg, 1924), pp. 512–584. Dr. Horn does not set specific time-limits for his essay, but, as a rule, he begins in the seventies or the eighties; and seldom does he mention any work published after 1920, the end-date of the work by Professor Hoops. Far less ambitious is the present survey, in which I shall attempt to give a brief conspectus of the chief works appearing in the field of English linguistics during the past seven years (1921–1927). My purpose is to indicate tendencies rather than to give a full bibliography, which latter, were it possible, would be inappropriate to the present occasion.[1]

I

Of works dealing with the history of the English language as a whole and published during the period under consideration the most noteworthy is the *Histoire de la Langue Anglaise Tome I. Des Origines à la Conquête Normande* (450–1066) (Paris, 1923), by Dr. René Huchon,

[1]This paper was read before the Department of English of the University of Texas on March 14, 1928, and is here published substantially as then delivered.

Professor of English in the University of Paris. This is a stout volume of 328 pages. As the author's purpose was to introduce French students to the history of the English language, this work is not as detailed as English and American students could wish for. Though not strong on phonology and on inflexions, it gives in the main a trustworthy history of our language from the beginnings until the Norman Conquest, and it gives this history from an individual point of view as well as from a national (French) point of view. By the latter I mean that Professor Huchon reveals that he is a Frenchman by his constant consideration of language (and incidentally of literature) from the artistic standpoint, and that his views are habitually expressed in impeccable French. By the former epithet I intend to suggest that, while Professor Huchon pays due and respectful attention to the views of other scholars, he often expresses original opinions, always with great modesty. His judgments concerning the Old English monuments seem to me, as a rule, more nearly just and adequate than are those in the great work by Émile Legouis, *A History of English Literature*, Vol. I, *The Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (650–1660), New York, 1926.

A revised edition, the fifth, of Professor Otto Jespersen's well-known *Growth and Structure of the English Language* appeared in 1926 at Leipzig.

A notable work dealing with a later period of our language is *A History of Modern Colloquial English* (London, 1920; 2d ed., 1921), by Dr. Henry Cecil Wyld, Professor of English in the University of Oxford. In this work no account is taken of vocabulary or of syntax, but a minute study is given of English pronunciation and (in a less degree) of English inflexions from the fifteenth century to the present, chief stress being laid upon the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries.

Here may be mentioned another work of distinction by Professor Wyld, namely, *Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope* (London, 1923), which draws inference as to pronunciation from an examination of the rhymes.

Quite recently Professor Wyld has published the third edition, revised and enlarged, of his *Short History of English, with a Bibliography of Recent Books on the Subject, and Lists of Texts and Editions*, New York, 1927.

A work of which all Americans will be proud is *The English Language in America* (New York, 1925), by Professor George Philip Krapp, of Columbia University. This work, sponsored by the Modern Language Association of America, was published by the help of the Revolving Fund of that association. The first volume has a chapter each on Vocabulary, Proper Names, Literary Dialects, Style, American Spelling, and American Dictionaries. The second volume is devoted largely to pronunciation, though a brief chapter is given to Inflection and Syntax. What impresses me most in this work is the catholicity of the judgments expressed. Professor Krapp's book moves in a region never touched by Mr. H. L. Mencken in his *The American Language* (New York, 1919; 2d ed., 1921; 3d ed., 1923), or by Mr. Gilbert M. Tucker in his *American English* (New York, 1921). Mr. Mencken seems to consider the jargon of the baseball nine or of the football team as truly typical of American speech as is the language of the schoolroom, the pulpit, or the forum; and contends, unsuccessfully I have always thought, that there is a national American language distinct from the speech of England. Mr. Tucker attempts to show that, however many solecisms we Americans are guilty of, our sins in this regard are venial as compared with those of our British cousins. Professor Krapp, on the other hand, holds, and I think demonstrates, that, as the title of his work indicates, America has no peculiar national language; that Americans speak and write the language of England, modified here and there, to be sure, in pronunciation and in vocabulary, but seldom or never to so great an extent as not still to deserve to be regarded as the English language. Often Professor Krapp shows that some pronunciation that has long been considered peculiarly American, as the *æ*-sound in *past, dance, path,* etc., exists

in certain regions of England.[1a] He shows, also, let me add, that this *æ*-sound is not restricted to the South Atlantic States, but is not infrequently found in sections of the North (even in the vicinity of Harvard) and of the Northwest. Long as is Dr. Krapp's discussion of this sound, however, he fails to give the deliverance of H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, who declares that those who lose on their ranches (as he has) uniformly say *rānch!* Did time allow, other illustrations could be given of the many instances in which a supposed Southernism or New Englandism is shown to be merely an importation from some shire of England. Finally, let it be said that, although much of this second volume retraces the ground covered by Professor Krapp's earlier work, *Pronunciation of Standard English in America* (New York, 1919), it covers the ground more thoroughly than did the earlier volume.

A second work just published by Professor Krapp on the same general subject, namely, *A Comprehensive Guide to Good English* (Chicago, 1927), as the title indicates, is intended primarily for a reference-book. But the author tells us, in his "Introduction," that the work "is devised not merely as a reference-book, like a dictionary, but as a book for reading, study, and reflection. Its purpose is to encourage direct observation of the varied possibilities of English speech as it appears in living use, spoken and written, and, as a consequence of such observation, to enable readers to make for themselves independent and sensible judgments in the practical use of the English language."

[1a]Unfortunately I have not access to Professor W. Franz's article on "American and British English," which appeared in the *Festschrift Friedrich Kluge* (Tübingen, 1926). The reviewer in the *Year's Work in English*, Vol. VII (London, 1928), p. 46, speaks thus of the work: "A comparative study of *American and British English* by Professor Franz, in the *Festschrift* for Professor Kluge, which was so sadly anticipated by his death, shows how many characteristic usages of American colloquial speech are derived from seventeenth-century English. On the other hand, Professor Scott's glossary of *American Slang* (S. P. E. Tract XXIV), compiled for the assistance of English readers of the works of Sinclair Lewis and others, gives ample justification for Mr. de Selincourt's worst fears."

The handbook is presented in the form of a dictionary; most of the articles are quite brief; and the *Guide* seems adapted to the expressed purpose of the author, though not so well adapted, it seems to me, as is his *The Knowledge of English*, noticed below. Professor Krapp makes a plea for "liberty of judgment," and modestly declares that "The judgments put down in this book are not to be regarded as absolute and final." Accordingly I shall call attention to one or two deliverances that do not tally with my own observations.

In Section 9 of his "Digest of Grammatical Rules," Professor Krapp makes this statement as to *like:* "The word *like* is current in unquestioned use as a preposition, as in *He rows like a professional,* but *like* as a conjunction, as in *I felt like I had stolen something,* for *I felt as though I had stolen something,* is ordinarily condemned by rhetoricians and grammarians, though it occurs occasionally in certain forms of local cultivated speech." I doubt whether *like* in the first quotation should be considered a preposition; to me the sentence seems merely an abbreviated form of *He rows like a professional rows;* if so, *like* in the first quotation does not differ essentially from *like* in the second quotation.

This statement in Section 13 of "The Digest" seems to discountenance the use of the relative pronoun *that* to stand for a person: "The relatives *which, that* ordinarily refer to inanimate objects and the lower creatures, as in *This is not the horse that I bargained for.*" Surely this statement is too sweeping in view of the numerous instances in which *that* has for its antecedent words like *man, woman, boy,* and *girl.* Indeed, in a restrictive relative clause there is a strong tendency to prefer *that* to *who* or to *which* when the antecedent of the relative is personal as well as when impersonal.

Professor Krapp's deliverance concerning *who* would shock the Earl of Balfour, who, when presiding at the first session of the International Council for English, on June 16, 1927, expressed "solicitude about the *m* in *whom,* and was inclined to regard the proper use of the word *whom*

as the shibboleth of educated men."[2] "In colloquial English," says Professor Krapp *(op. cit.*, sec. 16 [*b*]), "especially in questions, the form *who* is used for an objective, as in *who do you mean?* Though not strictly grammatical, this has passed into current spoken use and may be accepted on the colloquial level." I cannot quite accept the dictum either of the Earl or of the Professor. In my observation, an educated man seldom uses *who* instead of *whom* even in conversation, and, when he does, the *who* is due to a slip of the tongue, and is instantly changed to *whom.*

The late Miss Amy Lowell, it is said, was once heartbroken because her publisher had sought to eliminate one of her subjunctives. What would she have said to the following statements of Professor Krapp concerning the Subjunctive Mood *(op. cit.*, sec. 20 [*a*])? "The subjunctive mood in present English is restricted almost entirely to the condition contrary to fact, as in *If he were commander-in-chief, there is no question what he would do.* . . . In colloquial speech, even in the condition contrary to fact, the forms of the subjunctive appear frequently only when the subject of the verb is a personal pronoun, *I, you, he, she, we, they.* But in these constructions also, colloquial speech ordinarily has the indicative, as in *If he was here, he would tell us what to do; Tottering as if he was about to fall* (New York *Times); I wish I was in your place.* These uses are now so general that they must be accepted as at least good colloquial English." The quotations having an indicative here I should rate as "Low Colloquial" if not as "Illiterate." Surely all of us often use the subjunctive in the expression of a wish, as in *God bless you; The Lord deliver us from our friends.* And judicial and legislative bodies habitually use the subjunctive in decrees and resolutions, as in *It is ordered and decreed that the defendant, John Jones, be electrocuted; Resolved that the sum of $1,000,000 be and hereby is appropriated to the University of Texas.* If we include the forms of the verb made up of the auxiliaries *(may, might, can, could, would, should,* etc.) plus an infinitive, in hypothetical

[2]See *The Times* (London) of June 18, 1927.

or ideal statements, as true subjunctives, as I do, we have numerous occurrences of the analytic subjunctive in Modern English, as in *May God bless you; Oh that my enemy would write a book! Would you prefer coffee or tea? I should advise you not to do that.*

Still another recent work by Professor Krapp bears the somewhat puzzling title, *The Knowledge of English* (New York, 1927). A more discriminating title, it seems to me, would have been *The Principles of Language with Especial Reference to English.* The volume consists of thirty chapters, and deals with such topics as "English Dialects," "Correctness," "Analogy," "The Historical Study of English," "Structural Changes," "The English Vocabulary," "English Sounds," "Language and Style," "The Future of English," etc., etc. Like his *The English Language in America,* this later work is marked by breadth of knowledge and by catholicity of judgment. So many topics are taken up, however, that an adequate treatment is almost impossible in a single volume. And I find myself fearing that the work, despite its many excellent qualities, will prove too detailed for the student and too general for the scholar. This is the more unfortunate because in this volume to a greater degree than in any other of his works Professor Krapp is dealing with fundamental linguistic problems, problems that often concern not only English but all the members of the family of languages to which English belongs, the Indo-Germanic; indeed, he occasionally touches upon the most difficult problem of all,—the origin of language. These fundamental problems the author discusses in an independent and, at times, a penetrating manner; and, as already stated, in these discussions he habitually manifests a catholic spirit. What I miss most is the history of opinion. Professor Krapp adds a selected bibliography at the end of his book, but he seldom, if ever, cites any of these authors in the body of his work. The history of opinion would be of invaluable help to the seasoned scholar as well as to the young student in linguistics.

If I may be permitted to call attention to a few concrete statements by Professor Krapp, I should like, first of all, to cite his references to case in English grammar. On pp. 134–135, he tells us that, in *He walked two miles, miles* is by some text-books "said to be objective because some governing word like *for,* or *for the distance of* is understood," a proceeding to which he rightly objects, since, as he states, in Old English, measure in such instances was expressed by an accusative without a preposition, a fact that I had supposed accounted for the general use of the phrase, "the adverbial objective," in Modern English grammars, rather than the hypothesis of a preposition to be supplied, which hypothesis I have not seen advocated in recent years. On p. 135 Dr. Krapp continues: "In our present feeling there is no realization of an objective or accusative case at all in the word *miles* in *He walked two miles.* The words *two miles* are merely an adverb phrase modifying the verb. To justify the correctness of this idiom, it is not necessary to bring in the question of case at all, for the consciousness of case does not enter into the modern use of the construction, and *any discussion of case is irrelevant.*"[3] On the contrary, it seems to me that, since, when a noun was used adverbially in Old English, it was always in some oblique case, and since, in the locution in question, the noun was in Old English in the accusative, it is quite appropriate in Modern English to call *miles* an adverbial objective, though I should prefer to call it an adverbial accusative. Again, on p. 291, Dr. Krapp discusses the terminology for case-relations in English. Says he: "Case in Anglo-Saxon was indicated only partly by endings, but also by the fact that the nominative was the case of a noun standing before a governing word and the accusative, with which the dative was combined, was the case of a noun standing after a governing word. *Modern English has no other means of indicating case,*[3] for the dependent adjective and article naturally have not retained what the noun itself has relinquished. *Modern English grammars therefore very properly do not speak of a nominative and accusative case,*[3] but merely call what was

[3]The italics are mine.—M. C., Jr.

formerly a nominative the subject, and what was formerly an accusative, the object." In the clauses that I have italicized in the preceding quotation, Dr. Krapp seems to ignore several pertinent facts. Modern English indicates the genitive (possessive) case, not by position, but, as in Old English by an inflectional ending, a fact stated by Dr. Krapp himself on p. 292. Many Modern English grammars published in recent years (including the most recent, the *College English Grammar* by Dr. George O. Curme, Richmond, Va., 1925) follow the recommendations of the Committee on Grammatical Terminology of the United States and that of the British Committee to the effect that the terms *nominative, genitive, dative,* and *accusative* be used not only in Modern English grammars, but in the grammars of all Modern Languages. Strangest of all, Dr. Krapp here seems oblivious of the fact that, in his own *The Elements of English Grammar* (New York, 1908), he used the terms *nominative* and *dative,* and that, in his *Comprehensive Guide to Good English,* in the section of his Appendix entitled "I. Digest of Grammatical Rules," he himself several times uses the term *nominative* with reference to Modern English, as in Section 1: "Any word which is used as subject or object of a verb, as predicate nominative, or as object of a preposition is a noun." See, also, Section 16 (a) and (d).

In discussing the personal endings of the English verb, on p. 309, Dr. Krapp thus speaks of *-s,* the ending of the third person, singular, of the present indicative: "This is the only personal inflection left in the Modern English verb, and *it serves no useful purpose.*[4] If it is possible to say *I sang, you sang, he sang* without danger of misunderstanding, it would be equally possible to say *I sing, you sing, he sing.*" To my mind, however, this *-s* serves the very useful purpose of differentiating the indicative present, third singular, from the subjunctive present, third singular. The loss of *-s* would be as unfortunate, I think, as has been the loss of the personal endings of the subjunctive preterite of strong verbs (O. E. *he sǫng,* indicative; *he sunge,* subjunctive).

[4]The italics are mine.—M. C., Jr.

Once more, in several places Dr. Krapp indicates what topics should be omitted from Modern English grammar. Thus, on p. 279, he declares, "The whole discussion of gender could be, and should be, omitted from the grammar of Modern English." And on p. 249 we read: "The discussion of structure would very often be greatly simplified if the consideration of parts of speech were omitted and attention were focused only upon those elements which are essentially of structural significance"; and on p. 250: "Instead of beginning with the parts of speech, grammars therefore now tend more and more to begin with the sentence." How the most elementary analysis of a sentence can be made without taking some account of the parts of speech, of which all sentences are composed, I cannot understand. In his *The Elements of English Grammar*, instead of omitting "Gender" and "the Parts of Speech," Professor Krapp devoted three pages to the former topic and nearly two hundred pages to the latter. Of course, one has a right to change one's mind; but it seems to me that, in this instance, the last state of my friend is worse than the first.

On p. 250, in concluding the paragraph from which I have just quoted, Professor Krapp thus appraises the modern movement in matters grammatical: "The movement in recent years has therefore been in the right direction, *though one may question whether it has gone far enough and whether the modern grammarian has held closely enough to his new definition.*"[5] Some light is thrown on the question propounded in the italicized part of this sentence by these facts: a few years ago only half of the freshmen registered in the colleges of Indiana "knew the difference between one sentence and two sentences"; not a third of the freshmen registering in the University of Wisconsin "could distinguish between a whole sentence and a fraction of a sentence"; and, in my native state of Georgia, says a former instructor in the Georgia School of Technology, "the college teacher of Freshman English . . . is agreeably surprised if half of his class can point out the subject of a complex sentence; he is astonished if the same number can distinguish

[5]The italics are mine.—M. C., Jr.

between a phrase and a clause; and he feels that the spirit of fair play forbids any question concerning adjectives and adverbs."[6] If these results are truly typical, as I believe they are, since they come from some of the most reputable institutions in the nation, the modern movement has not as yet made a brilliant success in what it most stresses, the analysis of the sentence.

Akin to Dr. Krapp's *The English Language in America* is the volume by Professor J. S. Kenyon, of Hiram College, Ohio, entitled *American Pronunciation, A Textbook of Phonetics for Students of English* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1924). This book, however, as its subtitle indicates, deals primarily with phonetics; indeed, it is intended as an introduction to the subject of phonetics, and has been declared by so competent a critic as Professor Charles H. Grandgent, of Harvard, the best work of the kind known to him. Dr. Kenyon, who, I may add, is Professor of the English Language at his college, some years ago published an able monograph on *The Infinitive in Chaucer (Chaucer Society Publications*, London, 1909), and is to give a part of English 64 in our Summer Session of the current year.

A third work on the English Language in America is *The Standard of American Speech and Other Papers* (New York, 1926) by Professor F. N. Scott, of the University of Michigan. This book is made up of a series of interesting essays and addresses which had appeared in various periodicals before collection into the present volume. Owing to the variety of topics treated, the work does not admit of brief comment.

An illuminating essay by Professor W. A. Craigie, of the University of Chicago, *The Study of American English*, recently (1927) appeared as *Tract No. XXVII* of The Society for Pure English.

---

[6]For the basis of these statements see my essay, "The Present-day Attitude toward the Historic Study of the Mother-tongue" (in the University of Texas *Studies in English*, No 5, 1925), p. 46.

248313

Though called a dictionary, Mr. H. W. Fowler's *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (Oxford University Press, 1926) may appropriately be considered in this section, for it touches many points considered by Professor Krapp and by Professor Kenyon. The volume has been alternately severely condemned (as by Dr. E. Kruisinga, in an article entitled "English Grammar as She Is Taught at Oxford"[7]), and ardently praised by critics too numerous to be mentioned, two of the latter class being members of our own English staff. For my own part, I am bound to hold that both blame and praise have in many instances been excessive. Unquestionably too slight and too untenable a historic basis has been given to a number of the longer articles, as to those on the Subjunctive Mood and on *Shall* and *Will.* But, after all discounts have been made, the work is a rare achievement. Some of the articles on stylistic matters surpass any of the sort to be found in our better, if not our best, rhetorics; for these articles (such as those on "Inversion," "Battered Ornaments," "Out of the Frying Pan," "The Avoidance of the Obvious," etc., etc.) manifest keen thinking and uniformly excellent taste. Again, the articles on grammatical points, such as those dealing with case-relations, with relative pronouns, with sequence of tenses, with the phrase "that nose of his," etc., are in the main sound and severely practical. The treatment of spelling and of pronunciation is, as a rule, based on the *Oxford English Dictionary* (from which, as is well known, Mr. H. W. Fowler and his brother, now deceased, made that remarkable compend, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English,* Oxford, 1911, and *The Pocket Oxford Dictionary,* 1924), but at times Mr. Fowler dissents therefrom, and proves himself not a narrow partisan, but a citizen of the world, as when he favors the American *-or* to the English *-our* in words like *honor, flavor,* etc. Having said this much, I must add that I cannot approve such pronunciations as *contént,* noun; *optative, aither* and *naither* for *īther* and *nīther;* or such words as *a(i)nt* for *am not, burgle,* and *bust.*

---

[7]In *English Studies,* VIII, 1926, pp. 181–185.

These, however, are meme flecks. The *Dictionary* is truly remarkable for the variety of topics treated; as a rule, for the sanity of the judgments expressed; and, not least of all, for its unfailing vivacity and humor both in thought and in expression. To the intelligent reader, there is hardly a dull page in the 742. How could there be when one is constantly running upon sentences like the following?

P. ---[8]: "This word is as unnatural in this position as is the high heel of a lady's shoe under the middle of her foot."

P. 90: "*In connection with* is a formula that every one who prefers vigorous to flabby English will have as little to do with as he can: see Periphrasis."

P. 118: "*Distinction,* as a Literary Critics' Word, is, like *charm,* one of those on which they fall back when they wish to convey that a style is meritorious, but have not time to make up their minds upon the precise nature of its merits."

P. 266. Under the heading "Incongruous Vocabulary," illustrated in the sentence, "Austria-Hungary was no longer in a position, an' she would, to shake off the German yoke," Mr. Fowler thus comments: "The goldfish *an'* cannot live in this sentence-bowl unless we put some water in with it, and gasps pathetically at us from the mere dry air of *be in a position.*"

P. 364, under *mot:* "The *mot juste* is a pet Literary Critics' Word, which readers would like to buy of them as one buys one's neighbor's bantam cock for the sake of hearing its voice no more."

Far removed from the impartial attitude toward the English language of Mr. Fowler and of Professor Krapp is that of two Englishmen that have recently publicly expressed their views concerning the same. In his *Pomona, or, The Future of English* (London, 1927[?]), Mr. Basil de Selincourt speaks thus: "Only when we hear English on the lips of Americans do we fear for its integrity." Almost equally chilling are the words of Mr. J. R. R. Tolkien, Professor of Anglo-Saxon in Oxford University, who, in his review[9] of Professor Krapp's *The English Language in*

[8]Unfortunately I have lost the reference here, and must quote from memory.

[9]In *The Year's Work in English Studies,* Vol. VI (London, 1927), p. 65.

America, deprecates the cherishing of common ideals for the language of the English-speaking peoples. Says he: "To the American author, of course, it does not appear so clear as it does to us that the problem is no longer that of the freedom of America and her 'illustrious vernacular,' but of the freedom of England. Sir Walter Raleigh in a speech on 'Some Gains of the War' made in February, 1918, did not escape the notice of Dr. Spies when he said: 'the clearest gain of all is that after the War the English language will have such a position as never before. The greatest gain of all, the entry into the War of America, assures the triumph of our common language and our common ideals.' We have indicated above what we feel about linguistic triumph. Some even now are found to criticize the expression 'common language'; more might question 'common ideals' (and without necessarily implying any judgment concerning relative values); but to all it should be apparent that this triumph, if it takes place, is only likely to be 'common' if it is predominantly or wholly American. Whatever be the special destiny and peculiar future splendour of the language of the United States, it is still possible to hope that our fate may be kept distinct. And it is possible in *The English Language in America* to find reasons for making that hope more earnest."

Possibly as an antidote to such linguistic chauvinism as that manifested by Mr. de Selincourt and by Professor Tolkien an International Council for English, an inchoate academy, was formed at London during the summer of 1927 (on June 16–17). The purpose of the Council is stated in the following resolution, passed on June 17, 1928, as reported in the London *Times* of June 18, 1927: "It is agreed to form an International Council for English with reference to the problems of the common language of the English-speaking countries. This Council is to be an investigating body which will consider facts as to disputed usage and other questions of language in the various English-speaking countries, and give the results of its investigations the widest publicity: in short, will maintain the traditions and

foster the development of our common tongue." It was decided that the General Council should consist of 100 members, fifty of whom should be from the British Empire and fifty from the United States of America, and that members of the conference should provisionally form the nucleus of the General Council. As yet I have been unable to secure any detailed account of the first meeting of the Council and of its plans, but one is soon to be published by Professor Kemp Malone,[10] of Johns Hopkins University. Meantime, perhaps, you will enjoy this humorous account by Mrs. Elizabeth Stanley Trotter, which appeared in a recent number of *The Forum* (August, 1927), and which thrusts at some of the pronunciations supposedly recommended by the International Council:

"ET TU?

"An 'Advisory Committee,'
Robert Bridges, Shaw the witty,
Recently has been appointed,
Duly sanctioned and anointed,
To dispense pronunciation
To the docile British nation.

"Heralded as lawful masters
Of the radio-broadcasters,
Shall these sacerdotal censors,—
These pronuncio-dispensers,—
Have their way with me and you?
Stop them, Footpath-man! Ah, do!

"Made to go *à deux* with scenery,
Will you tolerate cen*tee*nary?
Is your resolution final,
To endure the word doctr*i*nal?
If you swallow eevolution,
Must we take to reevolution?

[10]Since my paper was read Dr. Malone has published in *American Speech*, III, 1928 (April), pp. 261–275, an interesting article entitled "The International Council for English."

"Though there's nothing new in pátent
Since they've rhymed it long with latent,
When of pat-riots they prate
Are they aching for debate?
If we hide behind our smiles,
Will they pelt us with missíles?

"Your eventual decision
On this Oxford-Pshaw revision,
Of their late pronunciation,
I await with consternation,—
Fearing, from your Highway, you
May have leanings that way too!

"Epilogue

"So, Pedestrian, won't you say
'Centenary's here to stay'?
Since that's patent, please do add
'Doctrinal is not so bad!
Missal does for prayers, or fight,
Evolution's plainly right.
As for pátriots, that's what we
'Ve always been and mean to be.'
Start a wordy warfare, do.
Take your pen and run them through!"

Pleasantries aside, it is to be hoped that the International Council may succeed in its announced purpose, to "maintain the traditions and foster the development of our common tongue." And, in the *Review of English Studies*, III, 1927, pp. 430–441, an omen of success is to be found in the thoughtful and gracious article by Professor J. H. G. Grattan, of University College, London, "On Anglo-American Cultivation of Standard English."

II

Several Bibliographies of great usefulness and of unquestioned erudition have recently appeared. Professor John Edwin Wells, of Connecticut College, has added a *Second Supplement* (New Haven, 1923) and a *Third Supplement* (New Haven, 1926) to his excellent *Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (New Haven, 1916).

Professor C. S. Northup, of Cornell University, has given us an extremely useful and comprehensive work in his *A Register of Bibliographies of the English Language and Literature* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1925).

But excellent as are the works just mentioned, they must yield the palm to *A Bibliography of Writings on the English Language from the Beginning of Printing to the End of 1922* (Cambridge [Mass.] and New Haven, 1927), by Professor A. G. Kennedy, of Leland Stanford University. Although some omissions occur (Dr. Kennedy was kind enough to write me that even in my two lectures on the *Historic Study of the Mother-Tongue,* Austin, Texas, 1925, were recorded titles that had been overlooked by him), these are relatively few and unimportant, and this Bibliography is an enduring honor to Professor Kennedy and to American scholarship. Additions will doubtless be made to this work, but it will never be superseded.

The year 1921 saw the beginning, in England, of two excellent bibliographical periodicals: (1) *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature,* compiled by members of the Modern Humanities Research Association and originally edited by Miss Anna C. Paues; (2) *The Year's Work in English Studies,* edited for the English Association of Great Britain and published annually by the Oxford University Press. And in 1923 the late Professor Albert S. Cook, of Yale University, had privately printed a List of his own publications, which list chronicled over three hundred items (exclusive of the *Yale Studies in English,* which were edited by him).

Among dictionaries of the English language may be mentioned, first of all, the great *Oxford English Dictionary* (formerly called the *New English Dictionary),* the last fascicle of which has just been sent to the press; Ernest Weekley's *An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English* (New York, 1921) and his *Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English* (New York, 1924); H. E. Palmer, J. V. Martin, and F. G. Blandford: *A Dictionary of English Pronunciation with American Variants in Phonetic Transcription* (Cambridge [England], 1926); and the "zweite, vermehrte

und verbesserte Auflage" of Ferd. Holthausen's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Englischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1927). It should be added that *A Dictionary of American English* has been projected by the University of Chicago, under the editorship of Professor W. A. Craigie, formerly an editor of the *Oxford English Dictionary.*

Three periodicals devoted exclusively to the English language and literature fall within our period: *Tracts of the Society for Pure English,* which began in 1920–1921, the *Review of English Studies,* and *American Speech,* the two latter dating from 1925.

Within our period, too, have been founded two excellent serial studies in English: *Giessener Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache und Kultur Englands und Nordamerikas,* under the editorship of the distinguished grammarian, Professor Wilhelm Horn, begun in 1923; and *Studies in English by Members of the English Seminar of the Charles University,* Prague, edited by Professors B. Foustka, G. Friedrich, and V. Mathesius and begun in 1924. The latter serial is published in Bohemian, but usually a summary of each work is added in English.

Several memorial volumes to distinguished English scholars contain noteworthy contributions to English linguistics. In *The Manly Anniversary Studies in Language and Literature* (Chicago, 1923), in honor of the distinguished mediaevalist, Professor John M. Manly, of the University of Chicago, occur articles on the English language by Professors Kemp Malone (Johns Hopkins University), W. F. Bryan (Northwestern University), J. F. Royster (University of North Carolina), J. M. Steadman, Jr. (Emory University), and A. H. Tolman (University of Chicago). In *Neusprachliche Studien, Festgabe Karl Luick* (Marburg, 1925), we find linguistic studies in the English field by Professors Eduard Sievers (Leipzig), Otto Funke (Prague), R. E. Zachrisson (Uppsala), Alois Pogatscher (Graz), Eilert Ekwall (Lund), and Otto Strauss (Kiel). In *Probleme der Englischen Sprache und Kultur, Festschrift Johannes Hoops* (Heidelberg, 1925), linguistic articles appear by Professors Lorenz Morsbach (Göttingen), Otto Funke (Prague),

Wolfgang Keller (Münster), and Walther Fischer (Giessen). *Anglica: Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie Alois Brandl zum Siebzigsten Geburtstage Ueberreicht* (=*Palaestra*, Vols. CXLVII and CXLVIII, Leipzig, 1925) devotes Bd. I to "Sprache- und Kulturgeschichte," which contains articles concerning the English language by Professors Wilhelm Horn (Giessen), E. Ekwall (Lund), A. Mawer (Liverpool), W. Keller (Münster), and K. Luick (Vienna).

III

But it is time to turn from works of this general sort to those that are of a more technical nature, and that deal with relatively limited periods and fields. Let us look for a moment at the Old English Epoch.

Several valuable editions of Old English texts have appeared during the years 1921 through 1927.

In the *Yale Studies in English* we have:—

Cook, Albert S., and Pitman, James H.: *The Old English Physiologus*, No. LXIII, 1921.

Chubb, Merrel Dare: *Christ and Satan: An Old English Poem*, No. LXX, 1925.

In the *Early English Text Society's Publications* (London) have appeared:—

Crawford, S. J.: *The Old English Version of the Heptateuch*, etc., Original Series, No. 160, 1921.

Rypins, Stanley: *Three Old English Prose Texts in MS. Cotton Vitellius XV*, Original Series, No. 161, 1924. The texts are (1) "Letter of Alexander the Great to Aristotle," (2) "Wonders of the East," and (3) "Life of St. Christopher."

In the Grein-Wülker *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa* (Hamburg) we find:—

Crawford, S. J.: *Exameron Anglice, or the Old English Hexameron*, Band X, 1921.

Endter, W.: *König Alfreds des Grossen Bearbeitung der Soliloquien des Augustinus*, Band XI, 1922.

From various publishers have come the following:—

Chambers, R. W., Professor in the University of London and editor of a *Beowulf* that appeared in 1914: *Beowulf, An Introduction to the Study of the Poem with a Discussion*

of the Stories of Offa and Finn, Cambridge [England], 1921.

Lindsay, W. M.: *The Corpus, Epinal, Erfurt, and Leyden Glossaries (Philological Society Series),* London, 1921.

Lindsay, W. M.: *The Corpus Glossary,* Cambridge University Press, 1924.

Kershaw, N. (=Mrs. H. M. Chadwick) : *Anglo-Saxon and Norse Poems,* Cambridge University Press, 1922.

Sweet, Henry: *An Anglo-Saxon Reader,* 9th ed., revised by C. T. Onions, Clarendon Press, 1922.

Sedgefield, W. J., Professor in Manchester University: *An Anglo-Saxon Verse Book,* Manchester University Press, 1922.

Klaeber, Frederick, Professor in the University of Minnesota: *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg,* Boston, 1922.

Williams, R. A.: *The Finn Episode in Beowulf. An Essay in Interpretation,* Cambridge University Press, 1924.

Millar, Eric George: *The Lindisfarne Gospels.* Three plates in colour and thirty-six in monochrome from Cotton MS. Nero D. iv in the British Museum, with pages from two related manuscripts, with Introduction, London, Milford, 1924.

Gordon, R. K., Professor of English in the University of Alberta, Canada: *Anglo-Saxon Poetry Selected and Translated by Professor R. K. Gordon* (in Everyman's Library), New York, 1927.

Gollancz, Sir Israel: *The Caedmon MS. of A. S. Biblical Poetry Junius XI in the Bodleian Library,* 127 pp. and plates, Oxford University Press, 1927.

Of the Old English works mentioned above, two are of extraordinary merit. The *Introduction to Beowulf,* by Professor Chambers, is distinguished equally for breadth of erudition and for lucidity of arrangement and of expression. The edition of *Beowulf,* by Professor Klaeber, has been universally and justly acclaimed a work of the first rank. It is amazing how much valuable information Dr. Klaeber has compressed into a single volume. In its compactness this work is comparable to the *Essays* of Lord Bacon, but not in lucidity of diction or in the massing of its details.

Among monographs appearing in the field of Old English during our period may be mentioned the following:—

Rademacher, Margarete: *Die Worttrennung in Angelsächsischen Handscriften,* Münster Dis., 1921.

Rothstein, Ewald: *Die Wortstellung in der Peterborough Chronik* (=Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, No. LXIV), Halle a. S., 1922.

Heidemann, Gerhard: *Die Flexion des Verbum Substantivum im Angelsächsischen*, Berlin Dis., 1924.

Small, George William: *The Comparative of Inequality: The Semantics and the Syntax of the Comparative Particle in English*, a Johns Hopkins Dis. (Greifswald, 1924), of which I recently published a review in the *American Journal of Philology*, XLVII (1926), 188–189.

Pons, Émile: *Le Thème et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne*, Strasbourg and Oxford, 1925.

Trnka, Bohumil: *A Syntactical Analysis of the Language of Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (=*Studies in English by Members of the English Seminar of Charles University*, No. II), Prague, 1925.

Uhler, Karl: *Die Bedeutungsgleichheit der Altenglischen Adjektiva und Adverbia mit und ohne -lic (lice)* (=*Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft 62), Heidelberg, 1926 (reviewed by the writer, in *Modern Language Notes*, XLIII, 1928, pp. 203–204).

Heinzel, Otto: *Kritische Entstehungsgeschichte des Angelsächsischen Interlinearpsalters* (=*Palaestra*, No. 151), Leipzig, 1926.

Weber, Georg: *Suffixvokal nach Kurzer Tonsilbe vor r, n, m, im Angelsächsischen* (=*Palaestra*, No. 156), Leipzig, 1927.

Several grammars of Old English deserve mention:—

Wardale, Edith E., Tutor at St. Hugh's College, Oxford: *An Old English Grammar* (New York, 1922), which, in the author's words, is "intended primarily to provide an introduction to the standard works of Sievers and Wright." A second, revised edition of this grammar appeared in 1926.

Wright, Joseph and Elizabeth Mary: *An Elementary Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1923).

Wright, Joseph and Elizabeth Mary: *Old English Grammar*, 3d ed. (Oxford, 1925), a thorough revision of their larger grammar, which appeared first in 1908 and in a second edition in 1914.

The last-named work, by Professor Joseph Wright, of Oxford University, and his wife, has many of the virtues associated with the several grammars of Gothic, Old High German, and Middle High German by this scholar, and is likely to remain the standard for years to come. The

Elementary Grammar of Old English by the Wrights, on the other hand, is merely a compressed, not a simplified, version of their larger work: like the latter, this smaller work traces the Old English sounds and inflexions through their Germanic forms back to their Indo-Germanic originals —a proceeding far from simple and of doubtful advantage in an introductory book.

Quite recently, I may add, there have appeared two Anglo-Saxon Readers intended for beginners, each with a brief—in my judgment far too brief—grammatical introduction: Wyatt, A. J.: *The Threshold of Anglo-Saxon* (Cambridge University Press, 1926); and Turk, Milton Haight, Professor of English in Hobart College: *An Anglo-Saxon Reader* (New York, 1927).

IV

In Middle English, also, some helpful work has been done during our period. Among text-books may be mentioned the following:—

Hall,[11] Joseph: *Selections from Early Middle English* (1130–1250), 2 vols., Oxford, 1920.

Sisam, Kenneth: *Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose*, Oxford, 1921.

Tolkien, J. R. R.: *A Middle English Vocabulary Designed for Use with Sisam's Fourteenth-century Verse and Prose*, Oxford, 1922.

Wright, Joseph and Elizabeth Mary: *An Elementary Middle English Grammar*, Oxford, 1923.

Brown, Carleton: *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, Oxford, 1924.

Moore, Samuel: *Historical Outlines of English Phonology and Morphology (Middle English and Modern English)*, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1925.

Jordan, Richard: *Handbuch der Mittelenglischen Grammatik, 1. Teil: Lautlehre*, Heidelberg, 1925.

Unfortunately untimely death precluded the completion of Dr. Jordan's *Mittelenglische Grammatik*. Dr. Moore's

---

[11]As this work is not mentioned by Professor Hoops, in his *Englische Sprachkunde*, it is included here, though antedating slightly our period.

work is quite brief and elementary. The Wright *Elementary Middle English Grammar* comes nearer deserving the epithet *elementary* than does his *Elementary Old English Grammar:* the Middle English sounds and inflexions are traced back, not to Germanic or Indo-Germanic, but to Old English. Moreover, Professor Wright's unparalleled familiarity with the English dialects has been of incalculable help to him in writing his *Middle English Grammar.* It is unfortunate, again, that in none of these Middle English text-books is any account given of syntax.

Among Middle English works not intended primarily for text-books should be mentioned the following:—

Morsbach, Lorenz: *Mittelenglische Originalurkunden von der Chaucerzeit* (=Morsbach's *Alt- und Mittelenglische Texte,* Vol. 10), Heidelberg, 1923.

Gollancz, Sir Israel: *Pearl, Cleanness, Patience, and Sir Gawain Reproduced in Facsimile* (=*Early English Text Society's Publications,* No. 162), London, 1923.

Hall, Joseph: *Selections from Layamon's Brut,* Oxford, 1924.

Tolkien, J. R. R., and Gordon, E. V.: *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight,* Oxford, 1925.

Flasdieck, H. M.: *Mittelenglische Originalurkunden* (1405–1430) (=Morsbach's *Alt- und Mittelenglische Texte,* Vol. II), Heidelberg, 1926.

Monographs in the Middle English field have dealt largely with phonology and syntax, though other phases of study have not been overlooked, as may be seen by an examination of the following:—

Stadlmann, Alois: *Die Sprache der Mittelenglischen Predigtsammlung in der Handschrift Lambeth 487* (=*Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie,* No. 50), Leipzig, 1921.

Marquardt, P.: *Das Starke Partizipium Praeteriti im Mittelenglischen,* Berlin Dis., 1922.

Bryan, W. F.: "The Midland Present Plural Indicative Ending *-e(n),*" in *Modern Philology,* XVIII, 1920–1921, pp. 121–137.

Hulbert, J. R.: "The 'West Midland' of the Romances," in *Modern Philology,* XIX, 1921–1922, pp. 1–16.

Malone, Kemp: "Studies in English Phonology," I. *au*, II. *ai*, in *Modern Philology*, XX, 1922–1923, pp. 189–200, and XXIII, 1925–1926, pp. 483–490.

Serjeantson,[1] Mary S.: "The Dialectical Distribution of Certain Phonological Features in Middle English," in *English Studies* (Amsterdam), Vol. IV, 1922, pp. 93–109, 191–198, 223–233.

Hittmair, Rudolf: *Das Zeitwort "Do" in Chaucer's Prosa* (=*Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie*, No. 51), Leipzig, 1923.

Wallenberg, J.: *The Vocabulary of Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwit, a Phonological, Morphological, Etymological, Semasiological, and Textual Study*, Uppsala, 1923.

Serjeantson,[2] Mary S.: "The Dialect of the Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter," in *English Studies* (Amsterdam), Vol. VI, 1924, pp. 177–199.

Stahl, Leon: *Der Adnominale Genitiv und Sein Ersatz im Mittelenglischen und Frühneuenglischen*, Giessen Dis., 1925.

Toll, J. M.: *Niederländische Lehngut im Mittelenglischen* (=Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, No. 69), Halle, 1926.

Fischer, Erna: *Der Lautbestand des Südmittelenglischen Octavian* (=*Anglistische Forschungen*, ed. by Dr. Johannes Hoops, Heft 63), Heidelberg, 1927.

Leidig, Paul: *Studien zu King Horn*, München Dis., 1927.

Serjeantson,[3] Mary S.: "The Dialects of the West Midlands in Middle English," in *Review of English Studies*, Vol. III, 1927, pp. 54–67, 186–203, 319–331.

MacKenzie, B. A.: *Contributions to the History of the Early London Dialect*, London, 1927.

Much excellent work has been done upon Chaucer, as is evident from a consideration of the following works:—

Root, Robert Kilburn: *The Book of Troilus and Criseyde by Geoffrey Chaucer*, Princeton University Press, 1926. This work is "edited from all the known manuscripts," Professor Root tells us, and has been declared a notable performance by so distinguished a Chaucerian as Professor Karl Young, of Yale. It has no grammatical introduction.

A work that is of great help to students of Chaucer, and that had engaged its author, Miss Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, for twenty-three years, was finished in 1925, namely, *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, 1357–1900*, 3 vols., Cambridge University Press, 1925. This work had been published serially by the Chaucer Society (Parts I–VII, 1914–1924).

An excellent supplement to Miss Eleanor P. Hammond's *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual* (New York, 1908) is *A Bibliography of Chaucer, 1908–1924 (University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature,* Vol. 4, No. 1), Seattle, Wash., 1926, by Dudley David Griffith, Associate Professor of English in the University of Washington.

Another invaluable help in the study of Chaucer is the magnificent *Concordance to the Complete Works of Chaucer and to the Romaunt of the Rose,* The Carnegie Institution of Washington, D.C., 1927, by Professor J. S. P. Tatlock, of Harvard, and Professor A. G. Kennedy, of Leland Stanford. This undertaking, suggested many years ago (as far back as 1871) by Dr. Frederic Furnivall, after many vicissitudes, duly recorded in the Preface, has been finally accomplished by the generous help of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. This work is a concordance in the proper sense of that word; and a Chaucer Dictionary is in preparation by Professor C. S. Northup, of Cornell University, and a Committee of the Modern Language Association of America.

Although only indirectly bearing on linguistics, I cannot refrain from mentioning four other recent works on Chaucer, namely:—

Aagee Brusendorff, of the University of Copenhagen: *The Chaucer Tradition,* London and Copenhagen, 1925.

John Matthews Manly, Professor in the University of Chicago: *Some New Light on Chaucer,* New York, 1926.

Walter Clyde Curry, Professor of English in Vanderbilt University: *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences,* New York, 1926.

Robert Dudley French, Associate Professor of English in Yale: *A Chaucer Handbook,* New York, 1927, a work similar to Professor Root's *The Poetry of Chaucer* (1st ed., Boston, 1906; revised ed., 1922).

George H. Cowling, Lecturer in the University of Leeds: *Chaucer,* London, 1927.

Two of these works on Chaucer manifest extraordinary diligence and erudition, those by Professor Curry and by Professor Manly, and show to what lengths the true scholar will go to discover any new light about the life or the works of a great poet. Apparently Professor Manly has modified the standpoint taken by him in his essay entitled "What Is the Parlament of Foules?" (in Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie,* L, 1913, pp. 278–290), in which he

sought to show that there were no historic prototypes for the characters in that poem, since in his latest volume he strives to discover historic bases for most of the leading characters among the Canterbury Pilgrims.

V

Let us turn now to the Modern English epoch.

As indicating the nature and the trend of the work being done in this field, I name several monographs that have recently appeared:—

Grant, William, and Dixon, James Main: *Manual of Modern Scots*, Cambridge University Press, 1921.

Horn, Wilhelm: *Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion* (=*Palaestra*, No. 135), 1st ed., Leipzig, 1921; 2d ed., 1923.

Laan, J. van der: *An Enquiry on a Psychological Basis into the Uses of the Progressive Form in Late Modern English*, Görinchem, Holland, 1922. This is a painstaking work of 137 pages, but unfortunately the author seems to have ignored the history of opinion as much as he claims that other investigators have ignored psychology, for he fails to take account of previous works on his subject.

Flasdieck, Hermann M.: *Forschungen zur Frühzeit der Neuenglischen Schriftsprache* (=Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Vols. 65, 66), Halle, 1922, which is characterized by the usual German thoroughness.

Müller, Karl: *Der Formenbau des Englischen Verbums im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, Giessen Dis., 1922.

Holmqvist, Erik: *On the History of the English Present Inflections, Particularly -th* and *-s*, Heidelberg, 1922.

Trnka, Bohumil: *Studies in the Syntactical and Phraseological History of the Verb "Have"* (=*Studies in English by Members of the English Seminar of the Charles University*, No. I), Prague, 1924.

Fries, Charles C., Associate Professor of English in the University of Michigan: "The Periphrastic Future with *Shall* and *Will* in Modern English" (in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XL, 1925, pp. 963–1024). The author tells us that to prepare this study he examined all the available English grammars published during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, and many of those of the first half of the nineteenth century.

Langenhove, George Ch. van: *On the Origin of the Gerund in English (=Recueil de Travaux Publiés par la*

Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Gand, 56e fascicule), Gand and Paris, 1925.

Kihlbom, Asta: *A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth-Century English,* I. (in *Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift,* Filosofi, Språkvetenskap och Historiska Vetenskaper, No. 7), 1926. Part I treats the stressed vowels in words of Germanic Origin; Part II, yet to be published, is "to treat the French word-material, the vowels of unstressed words and syllables, and the consonant system."

Morsbach, Lorenz: *Grammatisches und Psychologisches Geschlecht im Englischen,* 2d ed., Berlin, 1926, of which the first edition appeared in 1913.

Wilson, Sir James: *The Dialects of Central Scotland,* London, 1926.

Jespersen, Otto: *Notes on Relative Clauses* (Society for Pure English, *Tract No. XXIV),* London, 1926.

Jespersen, Otto: *On Some Disputed Points in English Grammar* (Society for Pure English, *Tract No. XXV),* London, 1926. This discusses (1) the phrase, "that long nose of his," and (2) the gerund in Modern English.

Fowler, H. W.: "On 'Ing,' a Reply to Dr. Jespersen's Paper in Tract XXV" (Society for Pure English, *Tract No. XXVI),* London, 1927, pp. 192–196.

Zachrisson, R. E.: *The English Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time as Taught by William Bullokar, with Word-lists from All His Works,* Uppsala and Leipzig, 1927.

Hogan, Jeremiah J.: *The English Language in Ireland,* Dublin, 1927.

Several grammars demand notice. In 1924 Professor and Mrs. Joseph Wright published *An Elementary Historical New English Grammar* (Oxford), marked by the same virtues as is their *Elementary Middle English Grammar,* of which we spoke above. In the same year, Mr. H. L. Palmer published *A Grammar of Spoken English on a Strictly Phonetic Basis* (Cambridge, England, 1924). In 1925 appeared our first *College English Grammar* (Richmond, Va.), by Professor George O. Curme, of Northwestern University. Dr. E. Kruisinga has recently (1926) brought out a fourth edition of his *A Grammar of Present-day English,* the first edition of which appeared in 1909–1912. And in the same year (1926) appeared a second edition of Dr. Max Deutschbein's *System der Neuenglischen*

Syntax, the first edition of which appeared in 1917. The year 1926 saw the completion of Mr. H. Poutsma's four-volume *Grammar of Late Modern English for the Use of Continental, Especially Dutch, Students* (Amsterdam), which work began to appear at Amsterdam in 1904. And the year just closed (1927) gave us an *Appendix* to the second volume of his *A Modern English Grammar,* and the third volume of the same, by Dr. Otto Jespersen, Professor of English in the University of Copenhagen, who published the first volume of this work at Heidelberg in 1909 and the second in 1914.

Several things are noteworthy about these grammars of Modern English. Except for the three texts first mentioned, these grammars are by foreigners. One is by a German (Deutschbein), two are by Dutchmen (Kruisinga and Poutsma), and one is by a Scandinavian (Jespersen). These foreign grammars of English have a wealth of examples unparalleled in any English grammar by a native of England or of America. The grammar by the German (Deutschbein), as each topic is discussed, gives a select and up-to-date Bibliography for the construction under consideration,—a feature not found in the grammars of our language written by Englishmen or Americans. Before beginning the Poutsma grammar, one should follow Lowell's advice to the prospective reader of Masson's *Life of Milton,*[12] and quaff a phial of *elixir vitae,* for this grammar has a total of 3,140 pages, an incredibly long work for a teacher in a gymnasium. While for other reasons besides its abundance of illustrative materials, the Poutsma work is deserving of praise, it has two serious shortcomings: often the categories unduly overlap, betraying the lack of keen discrimination; and frequently the author has failed to learn, or at least to give, the history of opinion on the subject under discussion. If, as I surmise from reading a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Poutsma,[13] he was in the main self-educated, his grammar is all the more a remarkable achievement.

---

[12]See Lowell's "Milton" in his *Among My Books,* Vol. II, 1884, p. 252.

[13]See the anonymous sketch in *English Studies,* Vol. VIII, 1926, pp. 65–67.

By far the most notable in this list of grammars is that of Professor Jespersen, who has recently published, also, a more general work entitled *The Philosophy of Grammar* (London, 1924), in which latter his illustrations are drawn chiefly from the English language. It will be convenient, therefore, to consider the two as practically one work. These two works are notable for keenness of perception, for independence of opinion, and for vigor of expression. However much one may demur to the opinions at times expressed, one cheerfully pays homage to so original and deep a thinker. Perhaps one of the chief services rendered by Professor Jespersen is to be found in his pointing out the inadequacy of some time-honored grammatical terms, as for instance, the names for some of the cases and the moods.

Although, in his *Philosophy of Grammar*, p. 343, Professor Jespersen declares that "It would evidently be utterly impracticable to throw the whole traditional nomenclature overboard and create a totally new one," he does throw away many of our best known grammatical terms, and substitutes therefor a brand-new set of names. How unnecessary is this wholesale casting away of the traditional terminology as to case-relations, I have striven to show in my recent essay "Concerning the Number of Cases in Modern English,"[14] in which I advocated the retention and the use in Modern English of the traditional terms, nominative, genitive, dative, and accusative,—a proceeding that had been strongly opposed by Dr. Jespersen.[14a] Equally unfortunate, it seems to me, is the Professor's radical handling of the traditional nomenclature concerning verbs, as given in

---

[14]This essay appeared in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* for March, 1927.

[14a]Since the present paper was written, two illuminating critiques of the Jespersen theory of cases have appeared. The first, which stoutly opposes that theory, occurs in a lengthy review of the third volume of Professor Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar*, by Professor George O. Curme, of Northwestern University, in *Language*, Vol. IV, 1928, pp. 135–148. The second, which ardently espouses that theory, occurs in *The Modern Language Review*, XXIII, 1928, pp. 129–144, in an essay by Professor W. E. Collinson, of the University of Liverpool. In the latter article, entitled "The 'Soul of

Chapters XIX and XX of his *Philosophy of Grammar*. As to tense, he would discard such common terms as historic past, progressive tenses, perfect tense, etc.; and he would set up "two separate sets of terms, one for the notional or natural divisions of time and one for the grammatical (syntactic) tense-distinctions."[15] He rejects even the age-old category, the substantival clause.

In his creation of new grammatical terms, Professor Jespersen has a laudable object, to give a distinctive name to each form and to each function of a part of speech. But this praise-worthy ideal is almost impossible of attainment under present conditions, when both in oral and in written discourse most words have several connations, if not meanings. Moreover, if the present-day student, at least in America, is as little acquainted with the few frequently used names for case-relations (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative), for tense-relations (present, preterite, future, etc.,) and for mood-relations (indicative, subjunctive, and imperative) as were the Ephesians with the Holy Ghost in the days of St. Paul, I cannot see how matters will be materially improved by the coining of new names for these relationships, especially when, as by some scholars, the number of technical names for such relationships is doubled. Or, to be more concrete, I cannot see what is to be gained by substituting, as Professor Jespersen does, "expanded tense"[16] for progressive tense, "content-clause"[17] for substantival clause, and "contact- clause"[18] for abridged relative clause, or "verbid"[19] for verbal as the name for an infinitive or participle; or by calling the locution *the dog barks*

Grammar' and the 'Philosophy of Grammar' with Special Reference to the Question of English Cases," as the title indicates, we have a review not only of Professor Jespersen's theory of cases but also of Professor E. A. Sonnenschein's *The Soul of Grammar*,—a work briefly considered by me later in the present essay.

[15]Jespersen, *Philosophy of Grammar*, p. 255.

[16]See his *Philosophy of Grammar*, p. 277.

[17]See his *A New English Grammar*, III, pp. 23 ff.

[18]*Ibid.*, pp. 81 ff.

[19]See his *Philosophy of Grammar*, p. 87.

furiously a "nexus"[20] and the locution a *furiously barking dog* a "junction."[20] As to the two expressions with *barks* and with *barking,* far simpler, I think, is Henry Sweet's[21] habit of saying that in the former combination we have a predicative statement and in the latter an assumptive statement. At any rate, the terms *nexus* and *junction* are so similar in their suggestions that a lapse of several days between reading Dr. Jespersen's definitions and an attempt practically to apply these definitions is likely to result in a mental hiatus rather than in a connection of any sort.

Nor, with all due respect to so great a scholar, does it seem wise to me to base the differentiation of the moods and the tenses almost exclusively upon the forms of the verb. Professor Jespersen's statement as to tense-differentiation was incidentally quoted above (p. 34). Concerning mood-differentiation he speaks as follows, in his *Philosophy of Grammar,* p. 313: "Further it is very important to remember that we speak of 'mood' only if this attitude of mind is shown in the form of the verb: mood thus is a syntactic, not a notional category." Such a restriction of the terms *mood* and *tense* would play havoc with Latin grammar, in which, as is well known to Professor Jespersen, the forms of the indicative and of the subjunctive at times coincide absolutely, as in the future perfect indicative and the perfect subjunctive with the exception of the first person, singular. It would play still greater havoc with Old English grammar, for even in that stage of our language often the indicative and the subjunctive coincided formally, as in the first person, singular, of the present tense of strong and weak verbs in West Saxon; in the first and third persons, singular, of the preterite tense of weak verbs; in the second person, singular, of the indicative and in the whole of the subjunctive, singular, of the preterite of strong verbs. It would almost deny to Middle English and Modern English the possession of a subjunctive mood, since, owing to the wholesale loss of endings for mood and tense in the later periods of our language, formal distinctions between indicative and subjunctive are far less frequent than in the

[20]See his *Philosophy of Grammar,* p. 97.

[21]See Henry Sweet, *A New English Grammar,* I, pp. 16–17.

Old English period. It would blot out the distinction between present tense and preterite tense in verbs like Modern English *set*.

Once more, Professor Jespersen allows far more weight to the occasional occurrence of anomalous constructions in writers of distinction than do most scholars. For instance, he seriously defends such locutions as the following: (1) "If I was to open my heart to you, I could show you strange sights" (Cowper); "If I was you"; (2) "I insist upon Miss Sharp appearing" (Thackeray, quoted from the *Oxford Dictionary);* and (3) "Arthur, *whom* they say *is killed* tonight" (Shakespeare's *King John*, IV, ii, 1659). The form *was* instead of the normal *were* in (1) above, Dr. Jespersen defends in his *Philosophy of Grammar*, pp. 266–267. Says he: "In literary language there has recently been a reaction in favour of *were,* which is preferred by most teachers; but in colloquial speech *were* is comparatively rare, except in the phrase 'if I were you,' and it is worth remarking that *was* is decidedly more emphatic than *were,* and thus may be said to mark the impossibility better than the subjunctive form." The example of the gerundial construction quoted from Thackeray in (2), which is more nearly excusable than the locutions quoted in (1) and (3), Dr. Jespersen ardently defends in his recent article, "Some Disputed Points in English Grammar," II. *"On Ing"* (in *Tract No. XXV* of the Society for Pure English, London, 1926, pp. 147–172). The Shakespearian example from *King John,* quoted in (3), he warmly champions in his *Philosophy of Grammar*, 349–351; and on p. 351 he declares: "A subject need not always be in the nominative, and the insertion of the words *we think*[22] can and does change the relation between the relative pronoun and its verb."

The chief grounds of Professor Jespersen's defense of the abnormal locutions quoted in the preceding paragraph are two: first, that he finds examples, duly quoted, of each of these constructions in a number of noted English authors;

[22]Dr. Jespersen is here reverting to another example quoted by him, on p. 349: "We need children *whom* we think *are* hungry."

and, secondly, that he can explain how such variations from the normal method of expression came about. The examples are genuine, though not numerous, and, as a rule, unquestionably proceed from writers justly accounted masters of English style. Professor Jespersen's explanations as to how these deviations arose are clever, and in the main are tenable; but the explanation could be put more briefly, I think, in the homely line of Burns, "To step aside is human." If Professor Jespersen held, as do some writers on linguistics, that the chief, if not the sole, function of the grammarian is to record usage, not to advise with reference thereto, I could come nearer understanding his defense of the accusative subject of a finite verb, as in the passage from *King John*. But in his great work, *Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin* (New York, 1922), pp. 319–320, he decries "the common belief of [some] linguists that one form of expression is just as good as another, provided that they are both found in actual use," and devotes the whole section to a plea for "Linguistic Estimation," the title he gives the section from which I have just quoted, and in which occurs this statement (p. 320): "No language is perfect, but if we admit this truth (or truism), we must also admit by implication that it is not unreasonable to investigate the relative value of different languages or of different details in language." Thus given by the master himself permission to evaluate the merit of a given construction, I should rule against the three quoted at the beginning of this section on two grounds, either of which would seem to me sufficient in itself. (1) To the normal mind, educated or uneducated, the conventional method of expression is clearer and more easily apprehended than is the abnormal method exemplified in the sentences quoted. (2) If the authority of great writers is to be appealed to, then I appeal from Shakespeare, Cowper, and Thackeray off their guard to these writers under normal conditions. For, while, as stated above, a number of examples is given by Dr. Jespersen of each of the three idioms, no statement is given as to how often the normal form occurs, and we have no information as to the relative frequency of the normal and the

abnormal methods of expression. Until Professor Jespersen or some one else informs us as to the relative frequency of the two methods of expression in the idioms under consideration, I shall continue to believe that the abnormal locutions quoted proceed from temporary nodding, and that the conventional locutions represent the usual habit of the authors cited. In a word, whether judged by the standard of lucidity or by the usage of the writers quoted, the passages from Shakespeare, Cowper, and Thackeray seem to me indefensible.

Had time allowed, I should have been glad to discuss some of the other points on which Professor Jespersen holds radical views, such as these: the loss of English inflexional endings was not due, as is generally held, to stress-obscuration; the earliest forms of human speech were not monosyllabic; etc.; etc. But enough has been said, I trust, to show the richness of his works.

Since writing my section on the works of Professor Jespersen, I have received *The Soul of Grammar* (Cambridge University Press, 1927), by Dr. E. A. Sonnenschein, Emeritus Professor of Classics in the University of Birmingham, England, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Grammatical Reform, and author of several grammars (English, French, Latin) in the series of Parallel Grammars. According to Professor Sonnenschein, grammar is a dry subject to many; hence he prefixes as a motto to his work Ezekiel's vision of dry bones *(Ezekiel,* XXXVII, 1–10); and, as was the case with the prophet of old, the bones come together and live,—a transformation brought about by the Professor's giving a comparative syntax of the three phenomena that, in his opinion, constitute the soul of grammar, namely, Case, Mood, and Tense. In the brief compass of 120 pages he gives "a bird's-eye view of the organic unity of the ancient and the modern languages studied in British and American schools." He seeks to demonstrate that many of the case-relations and many of the mood-relations

are substantially identical in the six Indo-Germanic languages upon which his book is based (Greek, Latin, German, French, Spanish, and English) ; and that the methods of indicating these logical relations of Noun and Verb, though somewhat changed in the course of centuries, have changed far less than has hitherto been supposed. He maintains that the analytic method of expression (that is, the indication of logical relations predominantly by the help of prepositions and of auxiliary verbs) was far more common in the ancient languages than has hitherto been conceded; and that there is not, therefore, so great a cleavage between the ancient and the modern languages as to warrant classifying the former as synthetic and the latter as analytic in structure. Undoubtedly he shows more analytic forms of verbal expression in the ancient languages than this writer was aware of. But, as a rule, these analytic forms are rare, or else began to develop in an appreciable degree only when the ancient languages (Greek and Latin) were taking on their modern forms and were giving us Hellenistic Greek and the Romance languages. Hence I think it still appropriate to speak of the ancient languages as dominantly synthetic and the modern languages as dominantly analytic. But I think that Professor Sonnenschein has done a real service in showing that, from the standpoint of syntax, these six languages are much more closely akin than has usually been thought. And we all owe him unstinted thanks for his brave and determined stand for evolution rather than revolution in grammar, especially the radical revolution advocated by Professor Jespersen and his followers, who would throw overboard almost all that has been done by previous grammarians, but cannot in most instances offer us anything better than that which they have jettisoned.

VI

To conclude, our seven years have given us several notable works dealing with the history of our language as a whole, as Huchon's *Histoire de la Langue Anglaise* and Krapp's

The English Language in America; two bibliographies of the first rank: Northup's *Register of Bibliographies of the English Language and Literature* and Kennedy's *Bibliography of Writings on the English Language;* and a distinguished *Dictionary of Modern English Usage,* by H. W. Fowler. The period has witnessed the completion of the *Oxford English Dictionary,* which was begun seventy years ago, is the product of thirteen hundred individuals, cost over a quarter of a million dollars, and is justly accounted the greatest dictionary ever published. In Old English, helpful monographs have been printed; two monumental works on *Beowulf* have been published, one by Professor R. W. Chambers, of England, and one by Professor Frederick Klaeber, of America; a great grammar of Old English has been finally achieved in the revised version of Professor Joseph Wright's *Old English Grammar;* and, strangest of all, an Anthology of Old English Poetry (by Professor R. K. Gordon) has been accorded a place in "Everyman's Library." In the field of Middle English, linguistic works of enduring worth have been issued, as the Middle English grammars by Jordan and by Wright, Miss Spurgeon's *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism,* Root's *Troilus and Criseyde,* and Tatlock and Kennedy's *Concordance to the Complete Works of Chaucer.* And two volumes of great erudition dealing with Chaucer from the historical-literary point of view have been given us, one by Professor Curry and the other by Professor Manly. As to the Modern English epoch, the period has witnessed the publication of some monographs of distinction and of several notable grammars of Modern English, one by a native Englishman, Professor Joseph Wright, and four by foreigners, namely, Deutschbein, Jespersen, Kruisinga, and Poutsma. One of these grammars is by one of the ablest and most distinguished of living scholars, Professor Otto Jespersen. And the latter's interest in English has led him to produce during our period three great works in the field of comparative grammar, (1) *Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin,* (2) *The Philosophy of Grammar,* and (3) *Mankind, Nation, and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View.*

Finally, Professor Jespersen's objurgatory remarks upon the *New English Grammar* by Professor E. A. Sonnenschein, have led the latter to publish *The Soul of Grammar,*— a brief but illuminating comparative syntax of six Indo-Germanic languages (Greek, Latin, French, Spanish, German, and English).

THE FIRST BRITISH COLONIZATION OF BRITTANY

By Clark Harris Slover

Those who are interested in the early population movements of western Europe will remember that in 1883 Joseph Loth established beyond question the fact that Brittany was colonized largely by emigrants from Britain.[1] Driven from their homes by a succession of plagues and by the onslaughts of the Anglo-Saxons, they sought refuge across the channel in great numbers and established there a population group that has persisted to the present day. If, as many scholars are prone to believe, the romantic traditions about King Arthur and his knights were built up largely in Brittany by expatriated Britons, the date of the first colonization is important to literary history.

It has been usually supposed that the colonization began in the middle of the fifth century, when the incursions of the Anglo-Saxons first reached serious proportions. There is good reason to believe, however, that there was a colony of some importance as early as the latter part of the fourth century. The fullest description of this colonization is given by Geoffrey of Monmouth *(ca.* 1136) in his legendary account of the revolt of Maximus A.D. 383 and the years following.[2] The story according to Geoffrey runs as follows: Octavius, King of Britain, being old and having no heir, was ready to bestow both his daughter and his throne upon a suitable candidate. Maximus, a young Roman, was persuaded to come to Britain and embrace the opportunity. Once there, he gathered the Roman army about him, enlisted the support of Conan Meriadoc, a British prince, and made himself master of the island. Then, taking with him an army composed of both Romans and Britons, he invaded Gaul. After killing Gratian, Roman emperor of the West,

---

[1] *L'Émigration bretonne en Armorique du V^e^ au VII^e^ siècle de notre ère*, Paris, 1883.

[2] *Historia regum Britanniae*, V, 9.

and conquering the whole country, he awarded to Conan Meriadoc, as recompense for abandoning his own land, the district of Armorica (Brittany) as an "altera Brittania." The original inhabitants were driven out and Britons were sent for to take their places. Later, after many victories, Maximus was killed by the friends of Gratian, and the army which he had brought with him was cut to pieces and dispersed. The survivors returned to Brittany and settled there.

Geoffrey's account, written some seven centuries after the event, is, of course, not to be trusted in detail. At the same time we must admit that in its general outlines it is entirely in accord with the best evidence we can get regarding the period under discussion. It seems to be based partly on the *Historia Britonum,* a ninth-century compilation ascribed to a Briton, Nennius. The version as given by Nennius, though less circumstantial with regard to the details of Maximus' revolt, is no less explicit regarding the colonization. It runs as follows:

"Septimus imperator regnavit in Britannia Maximianus.[3] Ipse porrexit cum omnibus militibus Brittonum a Britannia et occidit Gratianum regem Romanorum et imperium tenuit totius Europae et noluit dimittere milites, qui porrexerunt cum eo, ad Brittaniam ad uxores suas ad filios suos ad possessiones suas, sed dedit illis multas regiones a stagno quod est super verticem Montis Iovis usque ad civitatem, quae vocatur Cant Guic, et usque ad cumulum occidentalem, id est, Cruc Ochident. *(One manuscript adds here:* Britones namque Armorici, qui ultra mare sunt, cum Maximo tyranno hinc in expeditione exiuntes quonian redire nequiverant, occidentales partes Galliae solo tenens vastaverunt nec mingentes ad parietam vivere relinquerunt, acceptisque eorum uxoribus et filiabus in coniungium omnes earum linguas amputaverunt, ne eorum successio maternam linguam disceret. Unde et nos illos vocamus in nostra lingua Letewicion id est, semitacentes, quoniam confuse loquuntur.) Hi sunt Brittones Armorici et numquam reversi sunt huc usque hodiernum diem. Propter hoc Britannia occupata est ab extraneis gentibus et cives expulsi sunt, usque dum auxilium dederit illis."[4]

---

[3]Maximus and Maximian were different persons, but they were frequently confused in early British historical records.

[4]*Mon. Germ. Hist., Auctores Antiquissimi, Chronica Minora,* III, pp. 166–167 (par. 27).

M. de la Borderie has examined this tradition at some length in his *Histoire de Bretagne.*[5] The results of his examination lead him to reject not only the legend which makes Conan Meriadoc first king of Brittany but the whole story of the foundation of a British colony in Armorica. As far as I have been able to observe, M. de la Borderie's conclusions have been accepted as final. I believe, however, that in the interests of historical accuracy his objections should be given a somewhat closer examination than they have hitherto received.

In discussing the hypothesis of a fourth-century colonization, M. de la Borderie sets up the following criterion:

> "Pour être accepter comme vrai, un fait historique doit s'appuyer sur des monuments écrits d'une autorité certaine, ou sur une tradition longue et puissante dont il est impossible de demontrer la fausseté par des preuves concluantes" (p. 448).

Without questioning the duration of the tradition, which is amply demonstrated by the accounts in Nennius and Geoffrey, he produces as evidence of the falsity of that tradition the fact that Gildas, who composed an historical tract on the Britons about 547 A.D., did not mention the establishment of a colony. Gildas' account of the revolt of Maximus is as follows:

> "Itemque . . . insula . . . ad Gallias magna comitante satellitum caterva, insuper etiam imperatoris insignibus, quae nec decenter usquam gessit, non legitime, sed ritu tyrannico et tumultuante initiatum milite, Maximum mittit. Qui callida primum arte potius virtute finitimos quosque pagos vel provincias contra Romanum statum per retia periuri. . . . [Gildas goes on to enumerate the disgraceful acts of Maximus] Exin Britannia omni armato milite, militaribus copiis, rectoribus licet immanibus, ingenti iuventute spoliata, quae comitata vestigiis supra dicti tyranni domum nusquam ultra rediit. . . . "[6]

It should be admitted freely that Gildas does not say here that the British soldiers who accompanied Maximus to

---

[5]Rennes, 1905, II, 441–463.

[6]*Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Ant., Chronica Min.*, III, pp. 32–33.

Gaul stayed on and formed a colony; but he does say that they went over to Gaul and did not return. This statement, in connection with the traditions recorded by Nennius and Geoffrey, should establish a fairly good case for the fourth-century colonizations. But M. de la Borderie explains Gildas' statement in another way. He refers to the following passage written by Pacatus Drepanus in 391:

"Vix hoste invenerat, jam urgebat. Vix pectora viderat; jam terga caedebat. Datur debito rebelle agmen extitio; volvuntur impiae in sanguine suo turbae; tegit totos strages una campos, continuisque funeribus cuncta late operiuntur. Jam qui ad muros differenda morte properaverant, aut fossas cadaveribus aequabant, aut obviis sudibus induebantur aut portas, quas eruptione patefecerant, morte claudebant."[7]

His conclusion after reading this stirring account is that the reason why the British soldiers did not return to Britain was that they were all killed (p. 451). We must remember, however, that Pacatus was writing a panegyric to a royal patron. Other historians of about the same period do not agree with Pacatus as to the extent of the slaughter. Lacking the stimulus of a royal patron, they give less sanguinary accounts. Socrates Scholasticus, writing about the middle of the fifth century, describes the defeat of Maximus by the imperial forces sent out by Theodosian as follows:

". . . milites qui sub Maximo erant, apparatus bellici magnitudinem audientes, ne fama quidem tenus impetum sustinere valuerunt, sed timore perculsi, tyrannum ipsum vinctum imperatori; qui quidem interfectus est."[8]

Here we have a clear indication that the rebels, overawed by their opponents, gave over their leader without a struggle.

We get the same impression from Orosius, a Spanish historian who flourished in the early fifth century. His account of the final suppression of the revolt is as follows:

---

[7]"Panegyricus Pacati Theodosio dictus," Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, XIII, col. 509.

[8]Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, LXVII, coll. 594–599.

"Interea cum Theodosius in Oriente subactis barbarorum gentibus, Thracias tandem ab hoste liberas reddidisset et Arcadium, filium suum, consortem fecisset imperii, Maximus, vir quidem strenuus et probus atque Augusto dignus, nisi contra sacramenti fidem per tyrannidem emersisset, in Britannia invitus propemodum ab exercitu imperator creatus, in Galliam transit: ubi Gratianam Augustum subita incursione perterritum, atque in Italian transire meditantem, dolis circumventum interfecit . . . Theodosius . . . transmisit Alpes, atque Aquileiam improvisus adveniens hostem illum magnum, Maximum trucem, et ab immanissimis quoque Germanorum gentibus tributa ac stipendia solo terrore nominis exigentem, sine dolo et sine controversia clausit, cepit, occidit."[9]

Again we see that the revolt was settled suddenly and effectively by the capture and execution of the leader. The extermination of the army was clearly not necessary.

The case for the fourth-century colonization, therefore, stands thus. Gildas states that a large body of men went from Britain to Gaul and did not return. The natural assumption is that they remained as residents of the country. Tradition, as it finds public expression in the *Historia Britonum,* adds that they formed a colony in Armorica. M. de la Borderie believes that they could not have formed this colony because they were all killed. The accounts of the revolt by Socrates and Orosius, however, show us that Drepanus, the authority upon whom M. de la Borderie bases his conclusion, has greatly exaggerated the amount of the slaughter. There seems no reason, therefore, to deny the probability that a colony was formed in Armorica some time after the death of Maximus in 388.[10]

But M. de la Borderie has another objection. He calls our attention to the fact that Wrdisten, writing the life

---

[9]*Pauli Orosii Hispani presbyteri historiarum libri septem,* Migne, *Pat. Lat.,* XXXI, coll. 1149 ff.

[10]A. W. Wade-Evans *(Y Cymmrodor,* XXXI [1921], 75–76) thinks that Gildas trumped up the story of leading away of the young men under Maximus in order to excuse the Britons for their failure to repel the invasions of the Picts and Scots. Such a motive is so entirely out of harmony with Gildas' recognized anti-British attitude that it cannot be accepted without documentary support of the most authoritative character.

of St. Winwaloe about 880, was not aware of the establishment of this fourth-century colony, and he quotes Wrdisten to the effect that the emigration of the Britons occurred "*. . . tempore non alto quo gens barbara Saxonum maternum possedit cespitem*" (p. 450). M. de la Borderie has previously rejected the testimony of Nennius (p. 449) because he was writing some four hundred years after the event, and because the compilation which bears his name is usually considered a collection of fabulous legends. The same objections apply with equal force to the life of St. Winwaloe. He infers, moreover, from Wrdisten's statement the fact that the tradition "*n'était pas encore connue en Armorique ou elle y était tenue pour une fable.*" These facts are by no means implicit in Wrdisten's words. It hardly seems logical to assume that no one in the country accepted a fact merely because one man contradicts it. As for the actual existence of the tradition in Brittany, the very phrasing of Wrdisten's statement suggests, by its emphatic negation, the fact that the writer knew of the tradition and was denying it. The value of his denial is impaired, moreover, by the fact that the *Vita S. Winwaloei* was written in the interests of the abbey of Landevennec, of which Winwaloe was patron. Naturally there was much prestige to be gained by making the legendary founder, who lived in the fifth century, a member of one of the *first* families to come to Brittany. On the whole, since Wrdisten's statement bears the earmarks of controversy and is at variance with the account of Gildas and of other historians of the earlier period, it can hardly be accepted as an obstacle to our acceptance of the fourth-century colonization.

The next objection offered by M. de la Borderie is that all privileges and territorial grants made by Maximus to his supporters were revoked by the laws of Theodosius in 388, 389, and 395 (p. 450). This is incontestably true, and it effectually disposes of any theory of regal succession based on descent from the British prince Conan Meriadoc. On the other hand, these laws did not necessarily interfere with the existence of a colony. Granting that the Britons had to give up their holdings, it does not necessarily follow that

they quit the country. We must recall Gildas' statement that *they did not return.* If they were deprived of their territorial rights and did not return, they must have remained where they were in a state of subjection. The decree quoted by M. de la Borderie states that the partisans of Maximus were to be reduced *"ad pristinum statum"*;[11] that is, to the state in which they were before they acquired the territorial rights granted to them by the usurper. Because those who were given land had to give it up, must we assume that they vanished?

That the kingship of Conan Meriadoc is fabulous there can be little doubt. It is impossible, furthermore, to assume the existence of a British political or military establishment in Armorica immediately following the downfall of Maximus. The Britons who followed Maximus to Gaul were no longer a military organization. After their defeat and dispersion they naturally became a disorganized band of homeless men ready to take refuge anywhere. This may account for the fact that M. de la Borderie failed to find in the *Notitia Dignitatum* any mention of British troops in Armorica. At the same time, however loosely they may have been organized, their presence in Armorica may help to explain the promptness with which the Armoricans followed the British example in throwing off Roman rule in the early fifth century. Zosimus, a historian of the early fifth century, describes the revolt *(ca.* 410 A.D.) as follows:

"Itidem totus ille tractus Armorictius, caeteraeque Gallorum provinciae, Britannas imitatae, consimili se modo liberarunt, eiectis magistratibus Romanibus et sua quadam republica pro arbitrio constituta.[12]

Another fifth-century document refers to the efforts of Exuperantius to quell the revolt. Rutilius, a young Gaul, addresses the prince Palladius in these words:

---

[11]It is impossible to pass over this point without remarking how effectively the fact that laws were passed concerning the survivors demolishes M. de la Borderie's previous theory that all of Maximus' followers were killed.

[12]*Zosimi historiae graece et latine,* ed. J. F. Reitmeier, Leipzig, 1784, p. 519.

"Cuius Armoricas pater Exuperantius oras
Nunc postliminium pacis amare docet;
Leges restituit libertatemque reducit
Et servos famulis non sinit esse suis.[13]

A reference to another campaign carried on by Littorius about 437–439 indicates that in spite of the Roman efforts to enforce peace the Armoricans were still in a state of rebellion:

"Litorium Scythicos equites tum forte subacto
Celsus Aremorico Geticum rapiebat in agmen. . . . [14]

All that we can learn of the early Britons would lead us to expect this sort of disturbance. These turbulent people, left to shift for themselves in Armorica, acted as a ferment in the raising of civil strife just as they had done in Britain.

---

[13]*Cl. Rutilius Namatianus*, ed. J. Vessereau, Paris, 1904, Bk. I, line 213.

[14]Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmen*, VII, 246–247, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Ant.*, VIII.

A STYLISTIC DEVICE OF THE SAGAS INVOLVING THE SYNTAX OF THE SUPERLATIVE IN OLD NORSE[1]

By Jess H. Jackson

I

The reader of the Icelandic sagas frequently meets with a superlative construction which at first sight is likely to appear careless or puzzling or illogical (from the point of view of modern English grammar). If he is observant, he will soon notice that it often occurs in an initial description of a person and that it may be used variously, even applied to things. If he is persistent, he will discover that it is nothing but a stylistic device which seems to have arisen from the weakening of the superlative function. This study will examine a quantity of instances of this phenomenon and seek to explain it.

The famous portrait of Sigurðr in the *Vǫlsungasaga*[2] makes typical use of this superlative:

> Hann [Sigurðr] er langt umfram aðra menn at kurteisi ok allri hœfersku ok náliga at ǫllum hlutum; ok þá er talðir eru allir inir stœrstu kappar ok inir ágæztu hǫfðingjar, þá mun hann jafnan fremstr talðr . . . Hans líkami var skapaðr allr við sik á hæð ok digrleik þann veg, sem bezt má sama.[3]

But it must be remarked that, since Sigurðr is the hero *par excellence* of northern saga,[4] it is logical and natural to speak of him in superlatives. It is only when the same device is constantly used in the portraits of other heroes that

---

[1]The materials on which this study rests are generally from the *Islendinga Sǫgur*, with an occasional excursion into other groups of sagas. The excerpts containing the superlatives are from initial catalogues descriptive of persons, except in a few instances.

[2]*Die Prosaische Edda*, ed. Wilken, Paderborn, 1912, I, 190, 16 ff.

[3]*Loc. cit.*, lines 25 ff.

[4]In *Das Niebelungenlied* the hero is Siegfried, identical with Sigurðr.

confusion may arise. For illustration, I may choose three examples from *Laxdœla*[5] and *Njála*:[5a]

(1) Hann [Hrútr] var vígr allra manna bezt.[6]

(2) [Hǫskuldr þráinsson] var . . . manna bezt vígr.[7]

(3) Allra manna var hann [Herjólfr] bezt vígr.[8]

Patently, all three of these men could not logically be "best able to fight"—not in idiomatic English.

It was not only in the manly cultivation of war-like habits that saga men strove for the honor of being best; but (if the documents are to be trusted) like women they competed for the palm of personal beauty:

(4) Óláfr Hǫskuldsson er nú ok frumvaxti ok er allra manna fríðastr sýnum, þeira er menn hafi sét.[9]

(5) [Hǫskuldr þráinsson] var . . . manna fríðastr sýnum.[10]

(6) Hrútr [son of þorgerðr and Herjólfr] var allra manna fríðastr sýnum.[11]

(7) Hann [Kjartan] var allra manna fríðastr, þeira er fœz hafa á Íslandi.[12]

Among the saga women there is a veritable beauty contest rivaling that among the Greek goddesses, the one difference being that there is no northern Paris to settle the

---

[5]*I.e., Laxdœla Saga,* ed. Kr. Kaalund, Halle, 1896, heft 4 of *Altnordische Saga-Bibliothek,* hsg. Cederschiöld, Gering, and Mogk, Halle, since 1892 (17 hefte have already appeared); hereafter referred to as *ASB.*

[5a]*I.e., Brennu-Njáls Saga (ASB* 13), ed. Finnur Jónsson, Halle, 1908.

[6]*Laxdœla,* 47, 10.

[7]*Njála,* 215, 10 ff.

[8]*Laxdœla,* 16, 5.

[9]*Laxdœla,* 50, 16 f.

[10]*Njála,* 215, 10 ff.

[11]*Laxdœla,* 16, 18.

[12]*Laxdœla,* 80, 12 f.

dispute started by Eris's apple. Although the saga-writer chooses no winner, it may be that Hrefna Ásgeirsdóttir, who is said to be both "vænst" and "fríðust," merits the prize:

(8) "[Ingibjǫrg, daughter of Isi] was the fairest of women."[13]

(9) "Herdis, Bolli's daughter, grew up at Holyfell, and was the goodliest of all women."[14]

(10) Gunnhildr var allra kvenna vænst.[15]

(11) [Ingibjǫrg, King Olaf's sister] var þá með hirð Óláfs konungs ok þeira kvenna / fríðust, er þá váru í landi.[16]

(12) [Kǫrmloð, mother of King Sigtryggr of Ireland] var allra kvenna fegrst ok bezt at sér / orðinn um þat allt, er henni var ósjálfrátt.[17]

(13) Qnnur dóttir Ásgeirs hét Hrefna; / hon var vænst kvenna norðr þar í sveitum ok vel vinsæl.[18]

(14) [Hrefna, the same woman as under (13)] var en fríðasta / kona.[19]

(15) [Þórhalla Ásgrímsdóttir] var kvenna fríðust ok kurteisust.[20]

It is just as hard to tell which of the men of the sagas was the strongest:

(16) Þórólfr [Skallagrímsson] var þá hverjum manni meiri ok sterkari.[21]

(17) Þor- / bjǫrn [Oxnamegin] var allra manna sterkastr.[22]

---

[13]*Gisli the Outlaw*, tr. George Webbe Dasent, Edinburgh, 1866, p. 1.
[14]*The Laxdale Saga*, tr. Muriel A. C. Press, London, 1899, p. 269.
[15]*Egla, i.e., Egils Saga Skallagrímssonar*, ed. Finnur Jónsson, *(ASB* 3), Halle, 1894, 110, 5.
[16]*Laxdœla*, 131, 26 f.
[17]*Njála*, 401, 26 f.
[18]*Laxdœla*, 119, 4 f.
[19]*Laxdœla*, 137, 24 f.
[20]*Njála*, 62, 11.
[21]*Egla*, 109, 23.
[22]*Gretla; i.e., Grettis Saga Ásmundarsonar (ASB* 8), ed. R. G. Boer, Halle, 1900, 113, 11 f.

(18) Bergǫnundr [son of þorgeirr þyrnifótr] / var hverjum meiri ok sterkari.[23]

(19) þrándr [Stígandi] var / manna mestr ok sterkastr.[24]

(20) Hann [þræll þrándr] var allra manna mestr ok sterkastr.[25]

(21) Steinarr [sonr Ǫnunds sjóna] var allra manna mestr ok / ramr at afli . . . enn mesti kappsmaðr.[26]

Something like a direct contradiction to number (21) occurs in number

(22) "Of all men of Norway[27] of whom record hath come down to us was King Olaf in every wise the most skillful in manly exercise."[28]

It comes to positive contradiction in *Njála,* and that within such narrow space as to admit of no ambiguity:

(23) þórhallr Ásgrímsson . . / . . var enn þriði / mestr lǫgmaðr á Íslandi.[29]

(24) Eyjólfr [enn grái, sonr Bǫlverks] var . . . allra manna / lǫgkœnastr, svá at hann var enn þriði mestr lǫgmaðr á Íslandi.[30]

And here is another group of men each of whom excels all others in some particular and often identical manner:

(25) þorsteinn [Egilsson] var væn maðr, hvítr á hár ok eygr manna bezt.[31]

---

[23]*Egla,* 111, 1 f.

[24]*Eyrbyggja, i.e., Eyrbyggja Saga (ASB* 6), ed. Hugo Gering, Halle, 1897, 215, 18 f.

[25]*Egla,* 272, 8.

[26]*Egla,* 270, 11 ff.

[27]It must be remembered that the Icelandic sagas often deal with Norway and that Iceland was settled by Norwegians, *ca.* 872, *et seq.*

[28]*The Sagas of Olaf Tryggvason and of Harold the Tyrant,* tr. Williams and Norgate, London, 1911, p. 95.

[29]*Njála,* 329, 2 ff.

[30]*Njála,* 333, 16 f.

[31]*Gunnlaugs (Gunnlaugs Saga Ormstunga),* ed. Eugen Mogk *(Altnordische Texte* I), Halle, 1908, 1, 7 f. A modern Norwegian tr. of the words "eygr manna bezt" reads *hadde vakre öine* ([he] had pretty eyes).

(26) [Gísli] hittir bónda einn, er Réfr hét, sonr þorsteins / rannstafs, ok var allra manna slœgastr.[32]

(27) Maðr sá var með þorsteini [Skallagrímsson], er fra hét, / hverjum manni fóthvatari ok allra manna skygnastr.[33]

The next group introduces a few champions who are the best of their kind, whatever their peculiar excellence:

(28) "Ospak was a heathen, and the wisest of all men."[34]

(29) "Brodir . . . was of all men most skilled in sorcery."[35]

(30) [Hrafn] var mikill maðr ok sterkr, manna sjáligastr ok skald gott.[36]

(31) Ljótr hét maðr, er bjó á Mána- / bergi í fsafirði. Ljótr var mikill maðr ok / sterkr; hann var bróðir þorbjarnar, ok ho- / num líkastr um alla hluti.[37]

(32) Gaukr Trandilsson var fóstbróðir / Ásgríms, er frœknastr maðr hefir verit ok bezt at sér gǫrr.[38]

(33) Hann [Artús konungr] var allra konunga frægstr.[39]

Njála acquaints the reader with three very courteous women, two of whom are declared to possess other superlative qualities, in addition to their good manners:

(34) [þórhalla Ásgrímsdóttir] var kvenna fríðust ok kurteisust.[40]

---

[32]*Gísla (Gísla Saga Súrssonar: ASB* 10), ed. Finnur Jónsson, Halle, 1903, 71, 9 f.

[33]*Egla*, 282, 25 f.

[34]*The Story of Burnt Njal*, tr. Dasent, Edinburgh, 1861, II, p. 329.

[35]*Ibid.*

[36]*Gunnlaugs*, 7, 2 f. In modern Norwegian, Han var en stor og sterk mand, fager at se til, og en god skald (He was a big and strong man, fair to look at, and a good poet).

[37]*Hávarðs Saga Ísfirðings (Íslendinga Sögur*, ed. Valdimar Ásmundarson, Reykjavík, 1891–1907, vol. 13–15), 1896, p. 2.

[38]*Njála*, 62, 6 f.

[39]*Ívens Saga (ASB* 7), ed. Eugen Kölbing, Halle, 1898, 1, 3.

[40]*Njála*, 62, 11.

(35) Guðrún nattsol . . . var kvenna kurteisust.[41]

(36) [Unnr, daughter of Mǫrðr gígr] var / væn kona ok kurteis ok vel at sér, ok þotti sá kostr beztr á / Rangárvǫllum.[42]

A few other miscellaneous instances of this use of the superlative as applied to persons and a couple as applied to inanimate objects must close this catalogue:

(37) Ek hefi engan mann sét / jafnvaskligan at ǫllu.[43]

(38) Hann [óláfr pái] var þeira manna fríðastr / sýnum, er þá váru á Íslandi.[44]

(39) Þorgerðr [Egilsdóttir] var væn kona ok / kvenna mest.[45]

(40) Halli var gleiðimaðr mikill ok lögumaðr, ok hvárðamaðr hinn mesti.[46]

(41) Sterkare voru þeir miklu enn aðrir / menn flestir, er þa voru uppi.[47]

(42) [Friðþjófr inn frœkni] var allra manna stœrstr ok sterkastr.[48]

(43) Guðmundr . . . var . . . allbraðgjörr.[49]

---

[41]*Ibid.*, 131, 9.

[42]*Ibid.*, 1, 5 ff.

[43]*Laxdœla*, 191, 2 f.

[44]*Egla*, 255, 6 f.

[45]*Ibid.*, 255, 8 f.

[46]*Valla- Ljóts Saga (Íslendinga Sögur* 20–21), Reykjavík, 1898, p. 1.

[47]*Vǫlsunga saga ok Ragnars saga Loðbróks*, ed. Magnus Olsen, Köbenhavn, 1906–1908, p. 121, 21 f.

[48]*Friðþjófs Saga Ins Frœkna (ASB* 9), ed. Ludvig Larsson, Halle, 1901, 2, 8.

[49]*Gull-þóris Saga*, ed. K. Maurer, Leipzig, 1858, p. 58. Although the word is not a superlative, the intensive prefix *all-* lends it elative force. *Cf.* Zoëga, *A Concise Dictionary of Old Icelandic*, Oxford, 1910, and *cf.* the modern Icelandic *all-vel* (pretty well; tolerably well) and *alla-vega litur* (variegated; motley). The following modern Icelandic adjectives further illustrate the elative force lent by *all-: all-broslegur* (rather funny), *all-fagur* (pretty fine), *all-góður* (pretty good), *all-harður* (pretty hard), *all-langur* (pretty long), *all-mikill* (pretty big), and *all-ólíkur* (pretty unlike).

(44) [Arnkell] hefir verit / allra manna bezt at sér um alla hluti í fornum sið ok manna / vitrastr.[50]

(45) Manna var hann [Klaufi beggvir Snækollsson] svartastr bæði á brýnn ok / hár.[51]

(46) Guðmundr enn ríki var miok fyrir ǫðrom mǫnnum um rausn sína, at hann hafði hundrað hióna ek hundrað kúa.[52]

(47) Kári gaf Guðmundi gullsylju, en þorgeirr silfrbelti, ok / var hvárt tveggja enn bezti gripr.[53]

(48) þat [spjót] hafði Skarpheðinn gefit honum, ok / var en mesta gǫrsimi.[54]

II

The superlative in Old Norse normally expresses the highest grade. It is often weakened to the meaning of a very high grade;[55] that is, the *relative* superlative is frequently made *elative* or *absolute* in sense.[56] This principle is applied under three rules of Old Norse syntax:

1. The strong form[57] of the superlative, without addition, usually indicates the first grade (relative).

---

[50]*Eyrbyggja*, 137, 10 ff. This is one of the relatively few descriptive catalogues that occur elsewhere than at the beginning of the portrait. It is at the end.

[51]*Svarfdœla saga ok þorleifs þáttr jarlsskálds (Íslenzkar Fornsögar* III), ed. Finnur Jónsson, Kaupmannahöfn, 1883, 52, 16 f.

[52]*Liosvetninga Saga*, in *Origines Islandicae*, ed. Vigfússon and Powell, London, 1905, II, 365, 12 ff.

[53]*Njála*, 378, 10 f.

[54]*Njála*, 348, 13 f.

[55]Andreas Heusler, *Altisländisches Elementarbuch*, Zweite Auflage, Heidelberg, 1921, §393. (Hereafter referred to as *Elementarbuch.)*

[56]Similar conditions prevail in modern English, in which the superlative of the second grade is sometimes called the superlative of emphasis. *Cf. An Advanced English Grammar*, Kittredge and Farley, Boston, 1913, § 200.

[57]The Old Norse superlative takes the strong or the weak inflection. *Cf.* Noreen, *Altisländische und Altnorwegische Grammatik*, Vierte Auflage, Halle, 1923, §§ 423 and 432; and Heusler, *Elementarbuch*, §285, anm.

2. The weak form with the article is neutral, yet with inclination to the second grade (elative).

3. There are many exceptions to the rule that an added partitive genitive lends to the strong form (relative) the force of the second grade (elative).

Heusler cites some examples of the exceptions noted under Rule 3, and lists some peculiar forms that have arisen from aversion to joining a relative clause to a superlative in Old Norse,[58] an inhibition which modern English does not share.[59]

I have arranged the superlatives occurring in the excerpts given in Part I under the three rules stated here. The results are as follows: seven examples fall under Rule 1, seven under Rule 2, and two under Rule 3. The three rules, then, actually account for sixteen of these superlatives.[60]

What is important is that, of the sixty-one superlatives used in these excerpts, all but the seven under Rule 1 are elative in force and that forty of them fall under neither Rule 1 nor Rule 2 but tend toward violation of Rule 3; that is, they are strong, they accompany the partitive genitive construction, and they are elative.[61]

These forty recalcitrant superlatives are accounted for but not explained by Heusler's statement, "Die Grundbedeu-

---

[58]*Elementarbuch*, §§ 393 and 394.

[59]*E.g.*, þat suerþ hefer bezt komet til Nóregs translates into literal English, "This sword has best come to Norway," rather than "This is the best sword which has come to Norway."

[60]Really only *fourteen:* those under rule 3 are duplicates.

[61]My classification is this: under rule 1—(22), (23), (24), (36), (41), (44), and the word *fremstr* in the fourth line of the Sigurðr portrait; under rule 2—(21), (40), (47), (48), the words *stœrstu* and *ágœztu* in line 3 and the word *bezt* in line 5 of the Sigurðr portrait; under rule 3—(22) and (24); the forty near-violations of rule 3—(1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), (14), (15) two, (17), (19) two, (20) two, (21), (24), (25), (26), (27), (28), (29), (30), (31), (32), (33), (34) two, (35), (38), (39), (42) two, and (45); and special instances which are not superlatives in form but which give superlative force—(16), (18), (27), (37), (43), (46), and the words *langt umfram aðra menn* in the Sigurðr portrait.

tung des Superl., der höchste Grad, hat sich oft abgeschwächt zu der Bedeutung des sehr hohen Grades (Elativ)."[62] One wants to know why fifty-four out of sixty-one superlatives chosen at random from an extended course of reading have an elative[63] force and only seven a relative (or normal).

The principle of the faded-metaphor theory[64] may be urged in explanation of this decayed superlative. One has only to recall the latter end of words with high emotional content to appreciate its applicability; *e.g.*, such phrases as "innocuous desuetude" and the legion of journalistic banalities coined in an effort to be clever. After all, this *gefühlsmässig Hyperbel* is quite conventional if not entirely natural. One's Italian barber is actuated by an unconscious effort to intensify language when he uses the double comparative "more better," and similar constructions were a part of Shakspere's regular stock in trade.[65] The familiar "*Dearest* Mother," "the *best* of friends," "Isn't he the *biggest* dunce?"[65a] and similar efforts to heighten the force of language without implying a comparison, are instances in point, as well as "the salt of *most* unrighteous tears" and "O, *most* wicked speed"—examples of the superlatives of emphasis. Here belong the modern English "next," which has been weakened to the comparative sense,[65b] probably

---

[62]*Elementarbuch*, § 393.

[63]Literally, "lifted up."

[64]"The vocabularies of all languages are filled with faded metaphors."—Hanns Oerter, *Lectures on the Study of Language*, New York, 1909, p. 326. And compare the late Professor von Jagemann's statement, "Metaphors are sublimated idioms."

[65]*Cf. e.g.*, *The Merchant of Venice*, IV, i, 251, and Professor Brooke's note on this, in *Shakespeare's Principal Plays*, ed. Brooke, Cunliffe, and MacCracken (2nd ed., New York: Century, 1927), 127.

[65a]Cp. Swedish *med största nöje*, *min bästa vän* (my dear friend), and *käraste du*, which is perhaps less common than the positive *kära du*. Also Icelandic *kærasti* (sweetheart) and *í besta gæti* (going along well).

[65b]*Cf.* the Norwegian superlatives *mellemst* (middle; "most between") and *næst* (or *nest)*. The neatest illustration of this "fading" that I have met with occurs in a translation of Björnson's *Synnöve Solbakken*

because folk did not recognize its originally superlative form and force; also Chaucer's "atte beste," together with other similar phrases and words which generally mean "in the *best* manner possible," etc., and have lost the force of the original comparison.[66] These expressions have "faded" into English idioms. On the other hand, it is now a gross error to use the superlative in comparisons involving fewer than three persons or objects: one must say "Leave [the car!] by the *nearer* door," if there are only two doors in the car, and "The *best* three men" instead of "The three *best* men"—if one wants to escape illogicality. But "Put the

---

into modern Icelandic, in which the expression, Thorbjorn vilde *næsten* begynne at være glad is rendered, Þorbjörn var *nærri* því farin að hugsa um að verða glaður. *Nærri* is the positive form of the adverb; the Norwegian *næsten* is an adverb built on the superlative *næst*. *(Cf.* P. Groth, *A Norwegian Grammar* (3rd ed., Christiania: Cammermeyers, 1924), §316, and Valtýr Guðmundsson, *Islandsk Grammatik* (Köbenhavn: H. Hagerups Forlag, 1922), §§208, 212.

[66]Cp. Chaucer's *alderbest*, Shakspere's *alderliefest*, NHG *am ähnlichsten, am dichtesten, etc.*, Norwegian *allerhelst* (preferably; literally, "most rather"), *med det aller förste* (very soon; in a short time), *aller bedst det var*, a phrase equivalent to *bedst som det var* or *ret som det var* and meaning "all at once; suddenly," and Swedish *de allra flesta* (most; nearly all; most people) and *allra helst som* (especially since). Swedish has preserved the force of the superlative in many similar expressions: *den allra största, den allra vackraste* (the greatest, prettiest of all; the very greatest, prettiest), *det här sockret är allra bäst* (this sugar is the very best, the best of all), *den allra skönaste av Sveriges kyrkor* (the most beautiful of all churches in Sweden), and *det allra heligaste* (the holy of holies). Likewise occasionally modern Icelandic, as, for example, *allra-beztur* (the best of all; the very best; by far the best) and *allra-heilagra messa* (All-Saints Day), but with faded force in *allra-handa* (all kinds of), *allra-helzt* (particularly), *allra-mildastur* (most gracious), and *allra-þegsamlegast* (most humbly). Danish and Norwegian follow similar usage: Da. *Allerhöjstsamme* (His or Her Majesty), but *helvedes* (devilish)—*allerhelvedes* (devilish); Norw. *alleregnest* (one's very ownest own; intensely one's own), but *allernaadigst*, adj., (most gracious), adv., (graciously).

best foot *foremost"* defies both logic and grammar: it has become an idiom.[66a]

As far as the *grammar* of these Old Norse elatives is concerned, then, that is amenable to the same explanation as such constructions in English; that is, Old Norse idioms, like English idioms, frequently defy the rules of grammar. To English speakers, the *logical* infraction is more difficult to explain: English speakers nowadays eschew the illogical double negative so prevalent in the language of Chaucer and Shakspere.

Now in Old Norse this illogicality was overborne by another consideration; namely, an aptitude for conciseness. I believe that this essential genius of the language gives a clue to the preponderance of superlatives with elative force in the selections that I have cited, and hence in Old Norse documents in general.

The Norsemen were doers, not sayers. They performed their deeds first and then talked about them afterwards—in the long winter night beside the hearth-fire when it was impossible to perform more deeds outside. Their language was remarkably compact,—a mere fitting of words to the deed.[67]

This conciseness of the language depends in part on inflection, in part on omission of words necessary to the idiom of other languages, and in part on the genius of the Icelandic itself. Proverbs offer a good point of departure in

---

[66a]But the Dane says Sætte det bedste Ben foran (Put the best *leg* foremost) without any feeling of illogicality, just as he says "The *best* eye" or "The *oldest* of two children."

[67]"The dialogue [of the sagas], which is crisp and laconic, full of pithy saws and abounding in quiet grim humor or homely pathos, expressed in three or four brief words, is never needlessly used, and therefore all the more significant and forcible."—Vigfússon, *Sturlunga Saga*, Oxford, 1878, I. (Prolegomena), xxiv, §3.

"The Sagas . . [are] brief and reserved in their phrasing."—W. P. Ker, *Epic and Romance*, London, 1897, 281.

"[The saga writers] are . . . masters in the delineation of character, sometimes by a brief indication of the leading qualities in the man or woman spoken of, but much more often by the mere action of the story itself."—W. A. Craigie, *The Icelandic Sagas*, Cambridge University Press, 1913, p. 33.

illustrating it, because they are likely to be given aphoristic expression in all tongues. Old Norse frequently phrases them in about half the words required for like sentiments in idiomatic English. The following examples are typical:

Allt kann sá, er hófit kann.[68] Dasent's rendition uses twelve words to translate these six: "The man who knows how to forbear is master of all knowledge."[69] Although it would be possible to render this by "Who knows moderation, knows all," thereby shortening the original by one word, the result would be a gloss rather than a translation. The Old Norse equivalent of "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush" is Betri ein kráka í hendi en tvær í skógi. It would hardly be English to translate, "Better one crow in hand than two in woods." A literal translation of Hefir hverr til síns ágætis nǫkkut would run, "Has each till his glory somewhat"; yet a transference of the thought into the English equivalent would be something like this: "Each person has something connected with his excellence to boast about." The sententious quality of Fár bregðr enu betra, ef hann veit et verra could be brought out only by some such translation as "Seldom does one hasten to tell the better if one knows the worse." Dasent translates Veldrat sá er varar[70] by "His hands are clean who warns another."[71] Literal English, "Wields not that one who warns," would be both incomplete and hard to understand as well as two words longer than the original, the suffixed negative (veldr-*at)* and the omitted pronoun making the difference.

Of other Icelandic characteristics tending to compression, I cite two instances of the suppressed pronoun (a construction as common in Old Norse as it is rare in English, and as effective in Old Norse as it would be unintelligible in

---

[68]*Gisla*, 37, 11.

[69]*Gisli (Gisli the Outlaw*, tr. George Webb Dasent, Edinburgh, 1866), 49. Cp. the biblical "He that ruleth his spirit [is better] than he that taketh a city." *(Proverbs*, 16:32.)

[70]*Njála*, 93, 6.

[71]*Burnt Njal (The Story of Burnt Njal*, tr. Dasent, Edinburgh, 1861, Vols. I and II), I, 127.

English), and a couple of different kind: *(a)* í móti Gunnari gekk Vaðill ok hjó þegar til hans, ok kom í skjǫldinn,[72] literally, "Against Gunnar went Vaðill and hewed immediately at him, and came on the shield." But the meaning is that the weapon with which Vaðill struck at Gunnar hit the shield, not that Vaðill leaped upon Gunnar's shield. *(b)* Hǫskuldr gaf honum kenningarnafn ok kallaði pá:[73] "Hǫskuldr gave him [Óláfr, his bastard son] a surname and called [him] peacock." *(c)* þeir [Vagn spjót, Nafarr sax, and Skefill saerð] váru kunninjar Glúms Geirarson, ok ætluðu þangat til vistar til þeira feðga, Geira ok Glúms:[74] "They were acquaintances of Glúmr Geirarson and expected thither for a visit with those, father and son, Geira and Glúmr." *(d)* þorgeirr bauð [þorbergr] at búa til málit á hönd Glúmi:[75] "þorgeirr bade [þorbergr] to prepare a suit against Glúmr."

Five other examples show a sheer preponderance of words in the English translation: (1) Hví fórtu heiman?[76] "Why did you fare from home?" (2) þar tapaði Unnr kambi sínum, þar heitir síðan Kambsnes:[77] "There Unnr lost her comb, so it was afterwards called Combsness." (3) Fór heim síðan:[78] "[Somebody] afterwards went home." (4) Herðe fanz fátt um:[79] "Haurth paid little heed to it."[80] (5) Grét Helga þá sáran:[81] "Then Helga wept sorely." But the English is also especially concise in this instance.

As remarkable a model of this condensation and omission of style, and consequent swiftness of narration, as I have observed occurs when the saga-writer is telling how the outlaw Gísli Súrsson slew an adversary. The excerpt con-

---

[72]*Njála*, 67, 4 f.
[73]*Laxdœla*, 39, 9 f.
[74]*Reykdœla Saga (Íslendinga Sögur)*, Reykjavík, 1898, 59, 1 ff.
[75]*Ibid.*, 62.
[76]*Laxdœla*, 157, 8.
[77]*Laxdœla*, 9, 10 f.
[78]*Holmverja Saga (Origines Islandicae*, II, 67, 2).
[79]*Ibid.*, 67, 15.
[80]*Ibidem.*
[81]*Ibid.*, 80, 13.

cerns Gísli's maneuvers just after the slaying. I give the Old Norse and an interlinear translation for comparison:

Gísli snýr í brott skyndiliga til fjósins, gengr þar
Gísli turns away quickly to the cow-house, goes there

út sem hann hafði ætlat, ok lýkr aptr eptir sér ramliga; snýrr
out as he had planned, and locks back after himself strongly; turns

heim síðan ena sǫmu leið, ok má hvergi sjá spor hans. Auðr
home later the same way, and may no one see tracks his. Auðr

lætr loku frá hurðu, er hann kom heim, ok ferr hann í sæing
lets bolts from door, when he came home, and goes he into bed

sína, ok lætr sem ekki sé í orðit, eða hann eigi um ekki at
his, and lets on as if nothing had happened, or he had about it nothing to

vera. En menn allir váru ǫlœrir á Sæbóli ok vissu ekki,
be at. But men all were drink-mad at Sæbol and knew not,

hvat af skyldi ráða; kom þetta á þá óvara, ok urðu því eigi
what about it to do; came that on them unawares, and became therefore not

tekin þau ráð sem dygði.[83]
taken those counsels which availed.

By telescoping these two contributory explanations, I believe one can find the real explanation for this peculiar use of the superlative. The Norseman had a propensity to "wit" in language; therefore he sought brevity in his speech, trying, almost by instinct, to make the word suit the deed. Since the superlative in the construction under discussion was the most vivid form of expression, and since he no longer considered it as any more than the superlative of emphasis, he used it in order to save time. May be there was no thought in his mind about grammar or logic at all; he might have used the superlative in these constructions as the quickest means of saying what he wanted to say. He probably had the feeling that language is insufficient, as compared with deeds, and a desire to make it sufficient by

[83] *Gísla*, 40, 21 ff.

heaping it up,— a very natural and widespread speech-feeling.

After an examination of the evidence one must, I think, conclude that the saga-writers were conscious of no logical contradiction in heaping up these superlatives—that we are dealing with a form of expression which had become an idiomatic usage, a manner of writing. Although there can logically be but one *best* or *fairest* or *bravest* or *most courteous,* for the sake of emphasis the writer or speaker, even in the vernacular, frequently resorts to the use of the superlative. In colloquial English, the expression "He is the *best* kind of fellow" or "He made the *best* kind of defence" means no more than "He is an excellent fellow" or "He made a very good defence." Although the saga-writer might have said that seven persons were the *best* fighters in their district, he would have meant no more than that all seven were very good fighters. He would not have intended to state an illogicality or make a comparison. He would only have been using his native tongue with native speech-feeling for its native idiom.

ELIZABETH AS EUPHUIST BEFORE *EUPHUES*

By Theodore Stenberg

In his article on Euphuism in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* Sir Edmund Gosse has the following sentence: "Among those who applied themselves to this 'new English' [that is to say, Lyly's Euphuism], one of the most ardent was Queen Elizabeth herself, who has been styled by J. R. Green 'the most affected and detestable of Euphuists.' "[1] Both J. R. Green and Sir Edmund Gosse take the position that Elizabeth's interest in Euphuism was aroused by the tremendous vogue of Lyly's romances. It is this position that I wish to question. In fact, I hope to show that Elizabeth began to write very tolerable Euphuism three or four years before Lyly was born.[2]

Scholars are generally agreed that Euphuism was perfected by George Pettie, in his *Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure,* published in 1576, and by Lyly, in his two romances, published in 1578 and 1580 respectively. Professor Morris W. Croll has shown that there are passages of exexcellent Euphuism in Gascoigne's prose writings from the year 1575.[3] Professor Croll has also shown that Roger Ascham's *Toxophilus,* published as early as 1545, is definitely Euphuistic in spots.[4] It is not my purpose to trace the intricate and much-disputed history of Euphuism. I have referred to Ascham's Euphuistic tendencies merely because I am concerned with the style of his pupil, Elizabeth.

In Elizabeth's informal letters, we find practically all the characteristic patterns and devices of style which we have learned to associate primarily with Lyly. We find the characteristic balance of word against word, phrase against

---

[1]IX, 899.

[2]Lyly was born in 1553 or 1554.

[3]Lyly's *Euphues*, ed. M. W. Croll and H. Clemons, pp. LII–LIII.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. XLVI.

phrase, and clause against clause. We find repetition and alliteration (both simple and transverse), used as aids in the balancing of units. We find a very marked rhythm. We find exaggerated tropes and similes. We find the characteristic use of proverbs.

In 1550, in a letter to his friend and fellow-humanist, John Sturm, Ascham wrote the following sentence, concerning Elizabeth: "She greatly admires modest metaphors, and antitheses fitly combined and happily opposed."[5] In the same year, at the age of seventeen, Elizabeth wrote the following letter to her brother, King Edward the Sixth:

Like as the richeman that dayly gathereth riches to riches, and to one bag of mony layeth a greate sort til it come to infinit, so methinkes your Maiestie, not beinge suffised withe many benefits and gentilnes shewed to me afore this time, dothe now increase them in askinge and desiring wher you may bid and commaunde, requiring a thinge not worthy the desiringe for it selfe, but made worthy for your Higthnes request. My pictur I mene, in wiche if the inward good mynde towarde your grace migth as wel be declared as the outwarde face and countenaunce shal be seen, I wold nor haue taried the commandement but preuent it, nor have bine the last to graunt but the first to offer it. For the face, I graunt, I might wel blusche to offer, but the mynde I shal neuer be ashamed to present. For thogth from the grace of the pictur the coulers may fade by time, may giue by wether, may be spotted by chance; yet the other nor time with her swift winges shal ouertake, nor the mistie cloudes with ther loweringes may darken, nor chance with her slipery fote may ouerthrow. Of this althogth yet the profe coulde not be greate bicause the occasions hathe bine but smal, notwithstandinge as a dog hathe a daye, so may I perchaunce have time to declare it in dides wher now I do write them but in wordes. And further I shal most humbly beseche your Maiestie that whan you shal loke on my pictur, you wil witsafe to thinke that as you haue but the outwarde shadow of the body afore you, so my inward minde wischeth that the body it selfe wer oftner in your presence; howbeit bicause bothe my so beinge I thinke could do your Maiestie litel pleasur, thogth my selfe great good; and againe bicause I se as yet not the time agreing therunto, I shall lerne to folow this sainge of Orace, "Feras non culpes

[5]The original is *Verecundas translationes, et contrariorum collationes apte commissas, et feliciter confligentes, unice admiratur.* See Ascham's *Works*, ed. Giles, v. I, part I, p. 192.

quod vitari non potest." And thus I wil (troblinge your Maiestie I fere) ende with my most humble thankes. Besechinge God longe to preserue you to his honour, to your comfort, to the realmes profit, and to my joy. From Hatfilde this 15 day of May.

Your Maiesties most humbly sistar

ELIZABETH.[6]

Three years later, at the age of twenty, she wrote the following to her brother:

Like as a shipman in stormy wether plukes downe the sailes tarijnge for bettar winde, so did I, most noble Kinge, in my vnfortunate chanche a thurday pluk downe the hie sailes of my ioy and comfort and do trust one day that as troblesome waues have repulsed me bakwarde, so a gentil winde wil bringe me forwarde to my hauen. Two chief occasions moued me muche and griued me gretly, the one for that I douted your Maiesties helthe, the other bicause for al my longe tarijnge I wente without that I came for. Of the first I am releued in a parte, bothe that I vnderstode of your helthe, and also that your Maiesties loginge is far from my Lorde Marques chamber. Of my other grief I am not eased, but the best is that whatsoever other folkes wil suspect, I intende not to feare your graces goodwil, wiche as I knowe that I never disarued to faint, so I trust wil stil stike by me. For if your Graces aduis that I shulde retourne (whos wil is a commandemente) had not bine, I wold not haue made the halfe of my way, the ende of my iourney. And thus as one desirous to hire of your Maiesties helth, thogth vnfortunat to se it, I shal pray God for euer to preserue you. From Hatfilde this present Saterday.

Your Maiesties humble sistar to commandemente,

ELIZABETH.[7]

---

[6]Ellis, Henry, *Original Letters*, first series, II, 146–148. Even earlier than 1550, Elizabeth showed distinct leanings toward Euphuism. I quote, as perhaps the earliest extant example, the first sentence of a letter which she wrote in 1544, at the age of eleven, to her stepmother, Catherine Parr: "Not only knowing the effectuous will and fervent zeal, the which your highness hath towards all godly learning, as also my duty towards you, most gracious and sovereign princess; but knowing also, that pusillanimity and idleness are most repugnant unto a reasonable creature, and that (as the philosopher sayeth) even as an instrument of iron or of other metal waxeth soon rusty, unless it be continually occupied; even so shall the wit of a man or a woman wax dull and unapt to do or understand anything perfectly, unless it be always occupied upon some manner of study" (Mumby, Frank A., *The Girlhood of Queen Elizabeth*, pp. 24–25).

[7]Ellis, *op. cit.*, first series, II, 145–146.

From about this time we also have a letter to her sister, Princess Mary:

Good Sistar as to hire of your siknes is unpleasant to me, so is it nothinge fearful, for that I understande it is your olde gest that is wont oft to viset you, whose comminge thogth it be oft, yet is it never welcome, but notwithstanding it is comforttable for that "jacula praevisa minus feriunt." And as I do understande your nede of Jane Russels service, so I am sory that it is by my mans occasion letted, wiche if I had knowen afore, I wold have caused his wil give place to nide of her service, for as it is her duty to obey his commandement, so is it his part to attende your pleasure; and, as I confesse, it wer miter for him to go to her, sins she attendes uppon you, so indide he required the same, but for that divers of his felowes had busines abrode, that made his tarijnge at home. Good Sistar thogth I have good cause to thanke you for your oft sendinge to me, yet I have more occasion to rendre you my harty thankes for your gentil writinge, wiche how painful it is to you, I may wel gesse by my selfe, and you may wel se by my writinge so oft, how pleasant it is to me. And thus I ende to troble you, desiring God to sende you as wel to do, as you can thinke and wische, or I desire or pray. Frome Hasherige scribled this 27th of October.

Your lovinge sistar

ELIZABETH.[8]

Also in 1553, she wrote the following letter to her cousin, Lady Knollys:

Relieve your sorrow for your far journey with joy of your short return, and think this pilgrimage rather a proof of your friends, than a leaving of your country. The length of time, and distance of place, separates not the love of friends, nor deprives not the shew of good-will. An old saying, when *bale* is lowest *boot* is nearest: when your need shall be most you shall find my friendship greatest. Let others promise, and I will do, in words not more, in deeds as much. My power but small, my love as great as them whose gifts may tell their friendship's tale, let will supply all other want, and oft sending take the lieu of often sights. Your messengers shall not return empty, nor yet your desires unaccomplished. Lethe's flood hath here no course, good memory hath greatest stream. And, to conclude, a word that hardly I can say, I am driven by need to write,

---

[8]Ellis, *op. cit.*, first series, II, 163–164.

farewell, it is which in the sense one way I wish, the other way I grieve.

Your loving cousin and ready friend,

Cor Rotto.[9]

In 1554 Elizabeth wrote a letter to the Marquis of Winchester, Lord Treasurer of England. I quote the first sentence:

My Lord,

With hearty commendations I do most heartily desire you to further the desires of my last letters, that thereby the health of my mind and sickness may be the rather restored; and, as you were constrained to come the first unto me in the entry of my troubles, so would I wish yourself to be now the last that should freely end the same.[10]

As Roger Ascham was Elizabeth's tutor, it is of interest that some of his letters show the same Euphuistic tendencies as do hers. (I do not wish to imply that Ascham formed Elizabeth's style; I do believe that he influenced it.) In 1554 Ascham wrote the following to Sir William Pawlett:

Sir, my small time in marriage hath given me good experience that in choice of a wife to some men the grief in having an ill, is not comparable with the care in having a good; for I see many times the worse their wives wax, the more they make of themselves, and can digest that grief well enough. God, I thank him, hath given me such an one as the less she seeth I do for her, the more loving in all causes she is to me, when I again have rather wished her well than done her good, and therefore the more glad she is to bear my fortune with me, the more sorry am I that hitherto she hath found rather a loving than a lucky husband unto her. I did choose her to live withal, not hers to live upon, and if my choice were to choose again, I would even do as I did, so that the comfort I take because I have so good a wife is the only cause of my care, because she hath so poor a husband. For my own self, I could measure my mind to live as meanly as ever I did in Cambridge, but now my duty and love driveth me to further desire, and yet because I know not what may be thought of my deserving, my desire hitherto hath rather grieved myself with

---

[9]Mumby, Frank A., *The Girlhood of Queen Elizabeth*, p. 98.

[10]Green, M. A. E. W., *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies* (London, 1846), III, 296–297.

inward thought, than troubled other with outward suits. Nevertheless, I have had ever good hap, and specially in your goodness, who not presently to myself, but also in my absence often to others of your own accord have declared a friendly readiness to set forward any fit suit in my behalf, but the more gentle I have found you the less willing I have been to trouble you. Your most bounden to serve you, ROGER ASKAM.[11]

I believe (1) that Elizabeth's letters are little known to the student of English language and literature, (2) that they are of interest in themselves, and (3) that (considering Elizabeth's immense popularity) they must have been one of the main influences in the development of Euphuism. Even at the risk of being tedious, I shall therefore include four longer letters, written between 1554 and 1565. When Elizabeth was about to be committed to the Tower as a political prisoner, in 1554, she wrote a very characteristic letter to Queen Mary Tudor:

If any ever did try this olde saynge, that a Kinges worde was more than another mans othe, I most humbly beseche your Majesty to verefie it in me, and to remember your last promis and my last demande, that I be not condemned without answer and due profe: wiche it semes that now I am, for that without cause provid I am by your Counsel frome You commanded to go unto the Tower; a place more wonted for a false traitor, than a tru subject. Wiche thogth I knowe I deserve it not, yet in the face of al this realme aperes that it is provid; wiche I pray God, I may dy the shamefullist dethe that ever any died, afore I may mene any suche thinge: and to this present hower I protest afor God (who shal juge my trueth, whatsoever malice shal devis) that I never practised, consiled, nor consentid to any thinge that migth be prejudicial to Your parson any way, or daungerous to the State by any mene. And therfor I humbly beseche your Majestie to let me answer afore your selfe, and not suffer me to trust to your Counselors; yea and that afore I go to the Tower, if it be possible; if not, afore I be further condemned. Howbeit, I trust assuredly, your Highnes wyl give me leve to do it afor I go; for that thus shamfully I may not be cried out on, as now I shalbe; yea and without cause. Let consciens move your Hithnes to take some bettar way with me, than to make me be condemned in al mens sigth, afor my desert knowen. Also I most humbly beseche you Higthnes to pardon this my boldnes, wiche innocency procures me to do, togither with hope of your natural

[11]Ascham's *Works*, ed. Giles, v. I, part II, p. 413.

kindnes; wiche I trust wyl not se me cast away without desert: wiche what it is, I wold desier no more of God, but that you truly knewe. Wiche things I thinke and beleve you shal never by report knowe, unless by your selfe you hire. I have harde in my time of many cast away, for want of comminge to the presence of their Prince: and in late days I harde my Lorde of Sommerset say, that if his brother had bine suffered to speke with him, he had never sufferd: but the perswasions wer made to him so gret, that he was brogth in belefe that he could not live safely if the Admiral lived; and that made him give his consent to his dethe. Thogth these parsons are not to be compared to your Majestie, yet I pray God, as ivel perswations perswade not one sistar again the other; and al for that the have harde false report, and not harkene to the trueth knowin. Therfor ons again, kniling with humblenes of my hart, bicause I am not sufferd to bow the knees of my body, I humbly crave to speke with your Higthnis: wiche I wolde not be so bold to desier, if I knewe not my selfe most clere, as I knowe my selfe most tru. And for the traitor Wiat, he migth paraventur writ me a lettor; but, on my faithe, I never receved any from him. And as for the copie of my lettar sent to the Frenche Kinge, I pray God confound me eternally, if ever I sent him word, message, token, or lettar by any menes: and to this my truith I will stande in to my dethe.

Your Highnes most faithful subject that hathe bine
from the beginninge, and wylbe to my ende,
ELIZABETH.[12]

Of the longer letters of Elizabeth, the following, written to Queen Mary Tudor in 1556, is perhaps the most interesting specimen from the point of view of style:

When I revolve in mind (most noble Queen) the old love of Paynims to their princes, and the reverent fear of Romans to their senate, I cannot but muse for my part and blush for theirs, to see the rebellious hearts and devilish intents of Christians in name, but Jews in deed, towards their anointed king, which methinks if they had feared God, (though they could not have loved the state) they should for the dread of their own plague, have refrained that wickedness, which their bounden duty to your Majesty had not restrained. But when I call to remembrance that the devil *tanquam leo rugiens circumvenit, quaerens quem devorare potest*, I do the less marvel that he hath gotten such novices into his professed house, as vessels (without God's grace) more apt to serve his palace than meet to inhabit

[12]Ellis, *op. cit.*, second series, II, 255–257.

English land. I am the bolder to call them his imps, for that St. Paul saith, *Seditiosi sunt filii diaboli;* and since I have so good a buckler, I fear less to enter into their judgment.

Of this I assure your Majesty, it had been my part, above the rest, to bewail such things, though my name had not been in them, yet much it vexed me, that the devil oweth me such a hate, as to put me in any part of his mischievous instigations, whom, as I profess him my foe, (that is, all Christians' enemy) so wish I he had some other way invented to spite me.

But since it hath pleased God thus to bewray their malice, I most humbly thank Him, both that He has ever thus preserved your Majesty through His aid, much like a lamb from the horns of this Basan's bull, and also stirred up the hearts of your loving subjects to resist them, and deliver you to His honour and their shame. The intelligence of which, proceeding from your Majesty, deserves more humble thanks than with my pen I can render, which as infinite I will leave to number.

And among earthly things I chiefly wish this one, that there were as good surgeons for making anatomies of hearts (that I might show my thoughts to your Majesty) as there are expert physicians of bodies, able to express the inward griefs of maladies to their patients. For then I doubt not, but know well, that whatever others should subject by malice, yet your Majesty should be sure, by knowledge, that the more such mists effuscate the clear light of my soul, the more my tried thoughts should listen to the dimming of their hidden malice.

But since wishes are vain and desires oft fail, I must crave that my deeds may supply that which my thoughts cannot declare, and that they be not misdeemed, as the facts have been so well tried. And like as I have been your faithful subject from the beginning of your reign, so shall no wicked person cause me to change to the end of my life. And thus I recommend your Majesty to God's tuition, whom I beseech long time preserve, ending with the new remembrance of my old suit, more than for that I should not be forgotten, than for I think it not remembered.

Your Majesty's obedient subject and humble sister,

ELIZABETH.[13]

The next letter, written in 1563 to Thomas Williams, Speaker of the House of Commons, is an answer to the House's petition urging Elizabeth to marry. It will be noted that the letter is not too formal to contain considerable Euphuism:

---

[13]Mumby, *op. cit.*, pp. 214–215.

WILLIAMS,

I have heard by you the common request of my Commons, which I may well term, as methinks, the whole realm; because they give, as I have heard, in all these matters of Parliament, their common consent to such as be here assembled. The weight and greatness of this matter might cause in me, as I must confess, being a woman, wanting both wit and memory, some fear to speak, and bashfulness besides, a thing appropriate to my sex. But yet the princely state and kingly office (wherein God, though unworthy, hath constituted me) maketh these two causes to seem little in mine eyes, though grievous perhaps to your ears, and boldeneth me *(that* notwithstanding) to say somewhat in this matter, which I mean only to touch, but not presently to answer; for this so great a demand needeth both great and grave advice. I read a philosopher, whose deeds upon this occasion I remember better than his name, who always, when he was required to give answer in any hard question of school points, would rehearse over his alphabet, before he would proceed to any further answer therein, not for that he could not presently have answered, but to have his wit the riper, and better sharpened to answer the matter withal. If he, a private man, but in matters of school, took such delay, the better to show his eloquence, great cause may justly move me, in this so great a matter touching the benefit of this realm, and the safety of you all, to defer my answer to some other time; wherein, I assure you, the consideration of mine own safety, although I thank you for the great care that you seem to have thereof, shall be little in comparison of that great regard that I mean to have of the safety and surety of you all: and though God of late seemed to touch me rather like one that He chastised, than one that He punished; and though death possessed almost every joint of me, so as I wished then that the feeble thread of life, which lasted methought all too long, might, by Clotho's hand, have quickly been cut off; yet desired not I life then (as I have some witness here) so much for mine own safety as for yours; for I knew that, in exchange of this reign, I should have enjoyed a better reign, where residence is perpetual. There needs no boding of my bane. I know as well now as I did before that I am mortal; I know, also, that I must seek to discharge myself of that great burden that God hath here laid upon me: for of them *to whom much is committed, much is required.*

Think not that I, that in other matters have had convenient care of you all, will in this matter, touching the safety of myself and you all be careless. For know, that this matter toucheth me much nearer than it doth you all, who, if the worst happen, can lose but your bodies: but I, if I take not that convenient care that it behoveth me to have therein, I hazard to lose both body and soul; and though I am determined, in this so great and weighty a matter, to defer my answer till some other time, because I will not, in so deep a matter,

wade with so shallow a wit: yet have I thought good to use these few words, as well to show you that I am neither careless nor unmindful of your safeties in this case; as I trust you likewise do not forget, that by me you were delivered while you were yet hanging on the bough, ready to fall into the mud, yea, to be drowned in the doing; neither yet the promises which you have now made me concerning your duties and due obedience, wherewith I may and mean to charge you, as further to let you understand that I neither mislike of your request herein, nor of that great care that you seem to have of your own safety in this matter.

Lastly, because I will discharge some restless heads, in whose brains the needless hammers beat with vain judgment that I should mislike this their petition; I say that, of the matter, some thereof I like and allow very well; as to the circumstances, if any be, I mean, upon further advice, further to answer. And so I assure you all, that though, after my death, you may have many stepdames, yet shall you never have any a more natural mother than I mean to be unto you all.[14]

In 1565 Elizabeth sent Sir Henry Sidney (Sir Philip Sidney's father) to Ireland to take charge of affairs as her lieutenant governor. In addition to official instructions, she wrote him a private letter, mainly concerning his duties in the management of the disorder caused by the feud between the Earl of Ormond and the Earl of Desmond:

HARRY,

If our partial slender managing of the contentious quarrel between the two Irish earls did not make the way to cause these lines to pass my hand, this gibberish should hardly have cumbered your eyes; but warned by my former fault, and dreading worser hap to come, I rede you to take good heed that the good subjects' lost state be so revenged that I hear not the rest be won to a right bye way to breed more traitor's stocks, and so the goal is gone. Make some difference between tried, just, and false friend. Let the good service of well-deservers be never rewarded with loss. Let their thank be such as may encourage most rivers for the like. Suffer not that Desmond's denying deeds far wide from promised works, make you to trust to other pledge than either himself or John for gage: he hath so well performed his English vows, that I warn you trust him no longer than you see one of them. Prometheus let me be, Epimetheus hath been mine too long. I pray God your old strange sheep late (as you say) returned into the fold, wore not her woolly garment upon her

[14]Mumby, Frank A., *Elizabeth and Mary Stuart*, pp. 261–263.

wolvy back. You know a kingdom knows no kindred, *si violandum jus regnandi causa.* A strength to harm is perilous in the hand of an ambitious head. Where might is mixed with wit, there is too good an accord in a government. Essays be often dangerous; specially when the cup-bearer hath received such a preservative as, what might so ever betide the drinker's draught, the carrier takes no bane thereby.

Believe not, though they swear, that they can be full sound, whose parents sought the rule that they full fain would have. I warrant you they will never be accused of bastardy; you were to blame to lay it to their charge; they will trace the steps that others have passed before. If I had not espied, though very late, legerdemain used in these cases, I had never played my part. No, if I did not see the balances held awry, I had never myself come into the weigh-house. I hope I shall have so good a customer of you, that all other officers shall do their duty among you. If aught have been amiss at home, I will patch though I cannot whole it. Let us not, nor no more do you, consult so long as till advice come too late to the givers; where then shall we wish the deeds while all was spent in words; a fool too late bewares when all the peril is past. If we still advise, we shall never do; thus are we still knitting a knot never tied; yea, and if our web be framed with rotten hurdles, when our loom is welny done, our work is new to begin. God send the weaver true prentices again, and let them be denizens I pray you if they be not citizens; and such too as your ancientest aldermen, that have or now dwell in your official place, have had best cause to commend their good behaviour.

Let this memorial be only committed to Vulcan's base keeping, without any longer abode than the reading thereof; yea, and with no mention made thereof to any other wight. I charge you as I may command you. Seem not to have had but secretary's letter from me.

Your loving mistress,
ELIZABETH R.[15]

To bridge the gap between 1565 and the publication of Lyly's romances, I shall add two short letters and a part of a third. In 1569, nine years before the appearance of Lyly's *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit,* Elizabeth wrote the following letter to her cousin, Sir Henry Cary:

I doubt much, my Harry, whether that the victory given me more joyed me, or that you were by God appointed the instrument of my

[15]Aikin, Lucy, *Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth,* sixth edition, I, 402–404.

glory. And I assure you, for my country's good, the first might suffice; but for my heart's contentation, the second more pleaseth me. It likes me not a little, that with a good testimony of your faith, there is seen a stout courage of your mind, that more trusted to the goodness of your quarrel, than to the weakness of your number. Well, I can say no more; *beatus est ille servus quem, cum Dominus venerit, inveniet facientem sua mandata.* And that you may not think that you have done nothing for your profit (though you have done much for your honour) I intend to make this journey, somewhat to increase your livelihood, that you may not say to yourself, *Perditur quod factum est ingrato.*

Your loving kinswoman,
ELIZABETH REGINA.[16]

In 1573, five years before the publication of Lyly's first romance, Elizabeth wrote a letter to Sir William Fitzwilliam, Lord Deputy of Ireland, from which I quote one sentence:

Nicholas White, as appeareth by your letter, not daring to dissent against so running a consent, yet showed his conscience not to consent to affection, and would prescribe no punishment to that fact, which in his conscience he thought to be the duty of a good counsellor to do.[17]

John Nichols states that the next letter quoted is Elizabeth's expression of condolence to Lady Drury, on the death of the latter's husband, Sir William Drury.[18] According to the *Dictionary of National Biography*,[19] Drury died in 1579. As Lyly's two romances appeared in 1578 and 1580 respectively, this letter takes us to the end of our journey:

Bee well aware, my Besse, you strive not with divine ordinaunce, nor grudge at irremediable harmes, lest you offend the highest Lord, and no whitte amend the married hap. Heape not your harmes where helpe there is none; but since you may not that you would, wish that you can enjoye with comforte, a King for his power, and a Queene

---

[16]Fuller, Thomas, *The History of the Worthies of England*, ed. Nuttall, II, 48.

[17]Nicolas, Sir Harris, *The Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton*, p. 34.

[18]Nichols, John, *Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, revised edition (1823), I, p. XXIX.

[19]XVI, 62.

for her love, who leves not now to protect you when your case requires care, and minds not to omitte what ever may be best for you and yours.

Your most loving careful Soveraigne,
E. R.[20]

In closing, I shall give two short specimens of what purports to be Elizabeth's oral style. If Sir John Hayward's *Annals of Elizabeth* can be trusted, Elizabeth spoke the following words to her attendants, upon visiting the Tower in 1558:

Some have fallen from being Princes of this land, to be prisoners in this place; I am raysed from beeing prisoner in this place, to bee Prince of this land. That dejectione was a worke of God's justice; this advancement is a worke of his mercy; as they were to yeeld patience for the one, so I must beare my selfe towards God thankfull, and to men mercifull and beneficiall, for the other.[21]

In 1561 (according to Sir John Hayward again) Elizabeth spoke the two following sentences, as part of an answer to an ambassador from Mary, Queen of Scots:

Now, happely, the same men are not of the same mynd. But, as children, which, dreaming that apples are given them, whilest they sleepe are exceeding glad, but waking and finding themselves deceived of ther hope they fall to crying: soe some of them, who did highly favour mee when I was called Elizabeth, whoe, if I did cast a kind countenance uppon them, did foorthwith conceive that, soe soone as I should atteyne the crowne, they should be rewarded rather according to theire desires then ther desertes, now, finding ther happ not answeareable to ther hope (because noe prince is able to fill the insatiable gulfe of menes desires), they would happely be content with another change, uppon possibility thereby to better ther state.[22]

For more than thirty years before the publication of Lyly's romances, Elizabeth practiced Euphuism—or something very much like it. That her example should have failed to be an important influence in the development of

---

[20]Nichols, *op cit.*, I, p. XXIX.
[21]Hayward, Sir John, *Annals of Elizabeth*, ed. Bruce, pp. 10–11.
[22]Hayward, *op. cit.*, pp. 83–84.

Euphuism seems to me unbelievable. In this connection, it seems significant to me that when Professor Croll wished to give an example of Gascoigne's Euphuism at its best, he chose a passage which was written for one of the Entertainments of the Queen, and which was addressed direct to her.[23] Perhaps it is significant, also, that when Professors Franklin B. Snyder and Robert G. Martin had to decide upon a typical selection from Lyly's romances, for their textbook, *A Book of English Literature*, they chose the angelic picture and characterization of Elizabeth, as presented in *Euphues and His England*. What would be more natural than that courtiers like Gascoigne and Lyly should flatter the Queen in her own style, as well as strive to go her one better in the practice of that style?

---

[23]Lyly's *Euphues, op. cit.*, pp. LII–LIII. Professor Croll goes so far as to say that the style of the passage which he quotes from Gascoigne is more like Lyly's Euphuism than is that of any other work before Lyly's.

THE VERSION OF THE BIBLE USED BY PEELE IN THE COMPOSITION OF *DAVID AND BETHSABE*

By Arthur M. Sampley

In the fullest study yet attempted of the relation between Peele's *David and Bethsabe* and the Bible, Bruno Neitzel is very doubtful as to whether it is possible to say which version of the Scriptures was used by Peele in composing the play.[1] That Neitzel overstates the case, I wish to show in this paper, but it is unquestionably true that many difficulties beset any attempt to discover whether any one version of the Bible was the source of *David and Bethsabe*. In the first place, Peele may have used a Latin or a French Bible, of which a large number of versions had been printed before 1596.[2] The most natural assumption, however, is that he followed an English translation of the Scriptures. Six such translations had been made before 1596, although each of these had been reprinted, some of them many times and often with slight revisions and corrections.

The English Bibles which had been printed before the composition of *David and Bethsabe* are: Coverdale's Bible (1535), Mathew's Bible (1537), the Great Bible (1539), Taverner's Bible (1539), the Geneva Bible (1560), and the Bishops' Bible (1568).[3] Of these versions, only three were

---

[1]Bruno Neitzel, *George Peele's "David and Bethsabe,"* Halle, 1904, pp. 7–9. Neitzel has examined six editions of the Bible, the first two of which seem to be respectively the Coverdale Bible and the Great Bible and the last four, various editions of the Geneva version. He states (p. 9) that no one of these Bibles can be considered the one used by Peele, and concludes that the dramatist used no one certain version but wrote the play largely from memory, referring to the Scriptures for material in certain scenes.

[2]Peele died in this year. See E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage, III*, p. 459: "He [Peele] was buried as a 'householder' at St. James's, Clerkenwell, on 9 Nov. 1596 (Harl. Soc. Registers, xvii, 58)."

[3]A good brief discussion of early English translations of the Scriptures is to be found in Alfred W. Pollard's introduction to his *Records of the English Bible*, Oxford, 1911, pp. 1–37.

in general use in Peele's day: the Great Bible, the Bishops' Bible, and the Geneva Bible. It is therefore probable that Peele had at hand one of these three versions. I have, accordingly, examined a copy of the Geneva version as well as photostat copies of certain chapters of the Great Bible and the Bishops' Bible.[4] Moreover, I have consulted two copies of the early Vulgate, one printed in 1590 and one in 1484.[5]

We have two criteria by means of which to determine which Bible Peele used: viz., the forms of proper names, and the closeness of verbal parallels to the respective versions. I shall consider first the forms of the proper names. The table given below presents a comparison of certain names in *David and Bethsabe* with the corresponding forms in the Great Bible, the Bishops' Bible, the Vulgate of 1590, and the Geneva version.

David and Bethsabe	Great Bible	Bishops' Bible	1590 Vulgate	Geneva Bible
Bethsabe, Bersabe	Bethsabe	Bethsabe	Bethsabee	Bath-sheba
Cusay	Husai, Chusi	Hushai, Chusi	Chusai, Chusi	Hushai, Cushi
Abisay, Abyshai, Abyssus	Abysai	Abisai	Abisai	Abishai
Hanon, Hannon	Hanon	Hanon	Hanon	Hanun
Machaas	Maacah	Maacha	Maacha	Maacah
Ammon	Amnon	Amnon	Amnon	Amnon
Jethray	Jethream	Jethream	Jeth-raam *(acc. case)*	Ithream
Absolon, Absalon	Absalon, Absalom	Absalom	Absalom, Absalon	Absalom

[4]The photostats which I have used are from originals in the New York Public Library. They include the following portions of the two Bibles: Great Bible, 2 Kings, Chapter XI to about the middle of Chapter XIX; 3 Kings, Chapters I and II; Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, X. 4–XIX. 21; 3 Kings, I–II.

[5]Both these volumes are in the library of Dr. Alex. Dienst, of Temple, Texas, to whom I am indebted for the privilege of examining them.

David and Bethsabe	Great Bible	Bishop's Bible	1590 Vulgate	Geneva Bible
Adonia	Adonia	Adonia	Adonias	Adoniiah
Thecoa	Thekoa	Thekoa	Thecua	Tekoah
Sadoc	Sadock	Sadoc	Sadoc	Zadok
Jonathan	Jonathas	Jonathan	Jonathon	Jonathan
Ithay	Ithai	Ithai	Ethai	Ittai
Ahimaas	Ahimaaz	Ahimaaz	Achimaas	Ahimaaz
Achitophel	Ahithophel	Ahithophel	Achitophel	Ahithophel
Salomon	Salomon	Solomon	Salomon	Salomon
Chileab	Cheleas	Cheleas	Cheleab	Chileab
Rabath Rabba	Raba	Rabba	Rabba, Rabbath	Rabbah
Nahas	Nahas	Nahas	Naas	Nahash
Gesur	Gesur	Gesur	Gessur	Geshur
Urias	Urias	Urias	Urias	Uriah
Thamar	Thamar	Thamar	Thamar	Tamar
Semei	Semei	Semei	Semei	Shimei

It will be noted from this table that while in a few cases the 1590 Vulgate has forms nearer to those in the play, the Bishops' Bible and the Great Bible in general are closer to the drama. The Geneva version shows the widest variation from the play. It may be added that both the Great Bible and the Vulgate present variant forms of the proper names, though each of these versions is more consistent in its spelling than is Peele. Finally, while the table does not show conclusively that Peele made use of one of these versions rather than another, it does establish, I think, the fact that his play is much nearer to the Great Bible, the Bishops' Bible, and the Vulgate than it is to the Geneva version. It also suggests the possibility that the dramatist may have used two versions: either the Great Bible or the Bishops' Bible and a version of the Vulgate.

The second criterion for discovering the Bible followed by Peele is a comparison of the reading of certain passages in the play with the corresponding portions of contemporary versions of the Scriptures. This test is particularly valuable, inasmuch as Peele in several passages follows the Old Testament with unusual closeness. Thus of the 174 words

in Nathan's speech in ll. 658–679,[6] 94 words are found also in the Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XI. 7–12. The closeness to the English Bible in this passage seems to me to suggest that Peele was here following an English rather than a Latin version. Again, verbal parallels in ll. 930–940, 960–961, 1356–1357, 1361, 1399–1407 to the Great Bible and the Bishops' Bible seem to me to offer strong evidence of a connection between the English Bible and the play. The following passages, I think, present some evidence for Peele's use of an English version rather than the Vulgate as a source:

1. *David and Bethsabe*, ll. 665–666:

> And might (thou knowest) if this had ben too small
> Haue giuen thee more.

Vulgate,[7] II Reg., XII. 8:

> et si parva sunt ista, adjiciam tibi multo majora.

Bishops' Bible and Great Bible, 2 Kings, XII:

> and might (if that had ben to litle) haue geuen thee so muche more.[8]

2. *David and Bethsabe*, ll. 931–933:

> Two sonnes thy handmaid had, and they (my lord)
> Fought in the field, where no man went betwixt,
> And so the one did smite and slay the other.

Vulgate, II Reg., XIV. 6:

> Et ancillae tuae erant duo filii, qui rixati sunt adversum se in agro, nullusque erat, qui eos prohibere posset, et percussit alter alterum, et interfecit eum.

---

[6]In references here and below to lines in the play, I follow the Malone Society Reprint of *David and Bethsabe*, Oxford, 1912.

[7]Quotations from the Vulgate here and elsewhere in this paper are taken from the following edition: *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis Juxta Exemplaria ex Typographia Apostolica Vaticana Romae 1592 & 1593 inter Se Collata et ad Normam Correctionum Romanarum Exacta Auctoritate Summi Pontificis Pii IX. Edidit Valentinus Loch . . . Editio Quinta. Tomus I. Ratisbonae . . . MDCCCXXXVIII.*

[8]The wording of the Great Bible and of the Bishops' Bible is identical in this and the next passage quoted. The spelling is that of the Bishops' Bible.

Bishops' Bible and Great Bible, 2 Kings, XIV:

> And thy hande mayde had two sonnes, and they two fought together in the fielde, where was no man to go betweene them, but the one smote the other, and slue him.

The parallels which I have cited—and others might be added—seem to me to indicate that Peele made use of some English version of the Scriptures in the composition of his play. Yet there is some indication that he also used a copy of the Vulgate. For example, in l. 1057 there occurs the phrase, "mount of Oliues," which would be the translation of the Vulgate reading, "Clivum olivarum" (II Reg., XV. 30), but in the Bishops' Bible this phrase is rendered, "mount Olivet," while the Great Bible reads, "mount Olyvet." Moreover, the use of *Seruus* in ll. 707 and 713 suggests a Latin source.

A question that may also be considered in this connection is, Which English version did Peele use? While the problem can be finally settled only by an examination of all the contemporary versions, it is probable that Peele would use the Geneva version, the Bishops' Bible, or the Great Bible, these three being the only generally circulated Bibles in his day. Among these three, the evidence of both proper names and the reading of the text rules out the Geneva version. Moreover, it is more probable that Peele would use the Bishops' Bible, first issued in 1568, than the earlier and more antiquated Great Bible, which first came from the press in 1539. Fortunately, however, the question of which of these last two versions is closer to the text of *David and Bethsabe* can be settled more satisfactorily. There are twelve passages in the play which agree verbally with one of these Bibles but not with the other. These passages are listed below.

1. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 649:

> And he refus'd and spar'd to take his owne.

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XII. 4:

> And he spared to take of his owne sheepe.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XII:

> And he could not fynde it in hys herte to take of hys own shepe.

2. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 668:

> And hast done euill, and sinned in my sight?

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XII. 9:

> Wherefore then hast thou despised the commaundement of the Lorde to do euill in his sight.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XII:

> Wherefore then hast thou despysed the commaundement of the Lorde, to do wyckednesse in hys syght.

3. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 939:

> And leaue nor name, nor issue on the earth.

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XIV. 7:

> and shall not leaue to my husband neither name nor issue upon the earth.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XIV:

> that he shall stere up (to my husbande) nether name ner issue upon the erth.

4. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 1257:

> And bring the people to thy feet in peace.

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XVII. 3:

> And wil bring againe all the people unto thee: and when al shall returne, the men whom thou seekest [beyng slayne] all the people shalbe in peace.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XVII:

> And whan I haue slayne the man whom thou seekest, all the people shall haue rest.

5. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 1271:

> Lodge with the common souldiers in the field.

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XVII. 8:

> Thy father is a man also practised in warre, and wil not lodge with the people.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XVII:

> and maketh no tarienge with the people.

6. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 1405:

It may be he will looke on me this day.

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XVI. 12:

It may be that the Lorde will loke on myne affliction, and do me good for his cursing this day.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XVI:

haplye the Lorde wyll loke on my weping eyes and wretchednesse, and do me good for hys curssynge thys daye.

7. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 1450:

And I my selfe will follow in the midst.

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XVIII. 2:

I will go with you my selfe also.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XVIII:

I wyll go with you also.

8. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 1710:

What if thy seruant should goe to my lord?

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XVIII. 22:

What I pray thee, if I also runne after Chusi?

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XVIII:

come what come wyll, let me also runne after Chusi.

9. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 1870:

Peace and content be with my lord the King.

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XVIII. 28:

And Ahimaaz called and said unto the king, peace be with thee.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XVIII:

And Ahimaaz called, and sayd unto the kynge: good tydynges.

10. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 973:

I haue and am content to do the thing.

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XIV. 21:

Behold, I haue done this thing.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XIV:

I am content to do thys thyng.

Vulgate, II Reg., XIV. 21:

Ecce placatus feci verbum tuum.

11. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 1094:

Thou camst but yesterday.

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XV. 20:

Thou camest yesterday.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XV:

Thou camest but yesterday.

Vulgate, II Reg., XV. 20:

Heri venisti, et hodie compelleris nobiscum egredi?

12. *David and Bethsabe*, l. 1273:

Haue taught him lurke within some secret caue.

Bishops' Bible, 2 Kings, XVII. 9:

Behold he is hyd nowe in some caue.

Great Bible, 2 Kings, XVII:

Beholde he lurketh now in some caue.

Vulgate, II Reg., XVII. 9:

Forsitan latitat in foveis aut in uno, quo voluerit, loco.

It will be observed that in the first nine of these passages the Bishops' Bible is closer to the text of the play, while in the last three the Great Bible apparently offers a nearer parallel. Nevertheless, a comparison of the reading of the Vulgate with the last three passages will show that in each case the Vulgate could have furnished the parallel as easily as the Great Bible, except, perhaps, in l. 973, where, however, the Vulgate and the Bishops' Bible together could have furnished the present reading.

From the evidence presented above, it seems to me in the highest degree probable that Peele made use of the Bishops' Bible in the composition of *David and Bethsabe*. The evidence both of the proper names and of the reading of certain passages also tends to show, I believe, that he used some contemporary version of the Latin Vulgate. The theory that he employed two different Bibles would help to explain the frequent puzzling variations of the proper names within the play.

Fully as important as the version of the Scriptures employed by Peele is the use which he made of the Bible in the play. I hope to enter into this question in a future article.

MILTON'S CONCEPTION OF SAMSON

By Evert Mordecai Clark

Many years ago Professor H. M. Percival began his analysis of the central character of *Samson Agonistes* with the assertion that "Samson possesses the essential characteristics of a Hero of tragedy as laid down by Aristotle." After dwelling at length upon that character's "heroic virtues," "human frailty," and "deeply religious Hebrew nature," he concluded his survey by suggesting that Samson, aroused by Harapha, "contemptuous, aggressive, sarcastic, answering taunt with taunt, . . . in these traits . . . resembles the fiery, impetuous Ajax, as well as, it must be confessed, in the possession of strength without wisdom."[1] In recent years considerable emphasis has been placed upon this final observation as to the unheroic attributes of Samson's mind and soul. Thus one critic finds that the hero of Milton's tragedy "has been granted an unwieldy strength of body but impotence of mind."[2] Another commentator somewhat frivolously but entertainingly remarks: "Samson is one of the judges of Israel; but he has obviously missed his calling. His undergraduate escapades of the Gaza gates and the torch-bearing foxes; his susceptibility to feminine allurements; his absurd riddle with its humorless consequences, are but poor stuff whereof to make a tragic hero. Down to the final catastrophe there is hardly a dignified moment in his recorded career. And yet not far beneath the farce lie tears. For this clownish boy is a Nazarite. . . . He is sincere but unintelligent. When the spirit of the Lord is not upon him, he is helpless, a very Harapha."[3] In short, from the trend of recent criticism it would appear that Milton's Samson not only is dwindling in impressiveness as

---

[1] *Samson Agonistes*, edited by H. M. Percival, 1890, pp. xxi–xxiii.

[2] Curry, W. C., "*Samson Agonistes* Yet Again," *Sewanee Review*, July, 1924.

[3] Baum, P. F., "*Samson Agonistes* Again," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xxxvi, 354–371.

a tragic hero but is even degenerating into something of a sensualist, a dullard, a buffoon.

But what manner of man *is* Samson the Nazarite as Milton understands him and presents him, first and last?

If Professor Jebb was largely right in saying that "Milton's mind was in the literal and proper sense Hebraic," and that, "when a man with his bent of thought selected as the subject for a poem an episode in Hebrew history, the treatment of the subject was sure to be genuinely Hebraic,"[4] then the key, or at least the best approach, to any adequate understanding of Milton's hero will be found in the character of Samson as he is depicted in the biblical account. To understand the historic Samson, however, one must clear his mind, to some extent, of present-day religious and ethical conceptions and endeavor to assume the ancient Hebrews' point of view—that of a chosen people who are temporarily under the heathen heel but who believe implicitly in Jehovah's watchful care and overruling power. One must be prepared to hold the enemies of Israel in derision, to exact of them an eye for an eye, and to account it unto Jehovah's chosen instruments for righteousness that they despoil and trample upon the enemy without remorse.

Interpreted in this ancient light, Samson begins and ends his career the approved and irresistible champion of God. His advent is divinely announced; his regimen of food and drink and discipline is superhumanly devised. Like the greater Nazarite to come, the child increases in stature and in wisdom and in favor with God and man. Soon the youth acquires the lore of rocks and streams and lonely fields. From time to time he is uplifted by strange visitations of the Spirit; but he keeps his own counsel and rejoices in the secret of his strength. And now, arrived at manhood, he moves out along the concurrent lines of inclination and of duty, to choose a Philistine wife and thereby, in some manner vaguely discerned or yet to be revealed, to seek an occasion against his nation's foe and to initiate the deliverance of his people from the Philistine yoke. The occasion

---

[4]Jebb, Sir R. C., "*Samson Agonistes* and the Hellenic Drama," December 10, 1908, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, III, 2.

soon arrives, and Samson smites the enemy hip and thigh; but the timorous Israelites fail to rally to his support. In grief and rage he retires to lonely Etam, not to sulk or to hide, but to lament the death of his wife and to deplore the apparent failure of Jehovah's cause. When his people, who had failed to rise and follow him to freedom, come traitorously to deliver him to the foe, he voluntarily becomes their prisoner and pawn. And after the great deliverance that single-handedly he soon achieves, Jehovah cleaves "the hollow place that is in Lehi" and gives him drink. Despite apparent mistakes, the Nazarite is thus far in his course approved of God. That Israel likewise now vindicates and approves the champion of Lehi as a national hero who stands head and shoulders above his people, as well in mind and spirit as in might, is attested by the fact that Samson henceforth judges Israel for twenty years.

To interpret, then, the historic Samson as a lustful lover and foolish riddler is largely to misconceive the biblical account. Intimations of his opening career cause Samson's youthful spirit to leap for joy and his tongue to utter vigorous, mirthful, even prophetic things. Rightly understood, the "absurd riddle,"[5]

> Out of the eater came forth meat,
> And out of the strong came forth sweetness,

is seen to shadow forth deliverance to come. Doubtless the hero was susceptible to feminine charm; but his marriage choice, unaccountable to his people as it was in its defiance of convention and the law, was made, as I have said, under the promptings of Jehovah and with a certain dim awareness of his mission as a deliverer. Samson loved his beautiful but unfaithful wife and ruthlessly avenged her death; but his one recorded marital adventure was motivated primarily by a sense of duty rather than by desire. Throughout the periods of his youth, maturity, and supremacy in Israel, his character is devout, patriotic, impressively heroic.

---

[5]Baum, P. F., *op. cit.*

But Samson fell. His decline began with harlotry at Gaza and continued with the besotted love of Delilah at Sorek. The Bible leaves no doubt that the Samson of Gaza and of Sorek was a prodigal. It makes it equally clear, however, that this period of riotous living came far along in Samson's life and was of brief duration. Though he groveled among swine, he never lost his faith in God. And so it came to pass that even with the growth of his hair, the outward symbol of his obedience to God, began his rehabilitation in body, mind, and soul. At last we see him restored to his position of Nazarite and deliverer, praying confidently for Jehovah's aid, expiating willingly with his life his grievous sins, and triumphantly accomplishing in large degree the work that he had been appointed to do.

In reviewing the salient characteristics of the biblical Samson, we have gone no little portion of the way toward a proper understanding of the protagonist of Milton's play. The heaven-sent child, the commissioned Nazarite, the comrade of Jehovah, the superhuman man, the solitary roamer of the fields, the ardent lover, the disregarder of convention, the impetuous avenger, the deliverer, the judge, the prodigal, the penitent, the expiator, the vindicator of Jehovah—all this is common ground in the two accounts and justifies the view that Milton's Samson is essentially Hebraic. But there is need of guarding against the fallacious assumption that the two conceptions are identical. In the hands of a poet hardly less aglow with the warmth and color of the Renaissance than with the ardor of the Hebrew faith, Samson has undergone a transformation that must not be overlooked. Some aspects of the biblical character are omitted; a number of traits are added; a large proportion of the hero's characteristics are accentuated or diminished to emphasize the author's conception or to heighten the poetic or dramatic effect. Without retracing, then, the familiar story as it is presented in the play, but accepting as the heart of Milton's conception the Hebraic aspects of the character already pointed out, we may turn now to the modifications introduced.

As early as 1642 Milton idealizes the character as "that mighty Nazarite Samson; who being disciplined from his birth in the precepts and the practice of temperance and sobriety, without the strong drink of injurious and excessive desires, grows up to a noble strength and perfection with those his illustrious and sunny locks, the laws, waving and curling about his godlike shoulders."[6] The same poetic heightening is apparent in the play. The Bible makes no mention of Samson's comely looks. Milton's hero has "comeliness of shape," is "gloriously rigg'd" and "eminently adorned." The poet is particularly captivated with the symbolism and the beauty of Samson's hair. In each account Samson's might is irresistible, but Milton's Samson has much the finer conception of his strength. He is "God's mighty minister." His strength is a "consecrated gift." He is "with celestial vigour arm'd" and recognizes the fact that merely human power is "slight" and "vain." Thus Milton adds humility and comeliness to superhuman might.

In mental characteristics the divergence is more marked. Milton emphasizes Samson's intellectual powers. The dramatic figure has "heroic magnitude of mind." His "restless" intellect is busy with

> magnanimous thoughts
> Of birth from Heav'n foretold and high exploits

as well as active in less transcendental ways. In the elder Samson there is very little of self-criticism; here Samson is nothing less than "self-severe," defending skilfully the main course of his life, but denouncing in unmeasured terms his temporary "impotence of mind." Milton's hero is less credulous, more sophisticated, than Samson of old; he is "not at all surprised" at Dalila's assaults,

> each time perceiving
> How openly, and with what impudence,

she exercises her arts upon him. He is a fluent speaker, a skilful controversialist, able to answer argument with argument, taunt with taunt, assault with counter-assault; he

[6] *Prose Works*, Bohn Edition, II, 506.

can frame an eloquent soliloquy or address, in tragic or exultant strain, whether the theme be purely personal or patriotic or religious. His tongue is master of satire and invective as well as of simple pathos and exalted rhapsody. The sportiveness that is somewhat prominent in the elder Samson is not conspicuous in Milton's hero. "Not out of levity" does he succumb to Dalila. He disdains to be a "fool or jester." There is not the slightest indication that Samson's "undergraduate escapades of the Gaza gates"[7] were regarded by Milton in any other light than as fear-inspiring exhibitions of God-given and as yet unconquered might. On the whole, then, the mind of the modern Samson is more versatile, more serious and reflective, than that of his ancient prototype, and is adorned with "gifts and graces" which are peculiarly Miltonic but of which in the primitive mind of the elder Samson there is hardly a trace.

Temperamentally and emotionally the later hero has been given superior breadth and warmth. He is a tender-hearted son, in whom the mention of his father's name awakens "inward grief." The men of Dan revive their "old respect" for their "once gloried friend," whom "all men loved." To their sympathetic greeting,

> We come thy friends and neighbors not unknown,

he warm-heartedly replies,

> Your coming, friends, revives me.

The original portrait exhibits little of this filial tenderness and nothing of this neighborly love. Furthermore, his interest in external nature is more explicitly revealed in Milton's play. With fine sensitiveness Samson observes that

> Yonder bank hath choice of sun or shade,

that there he can

> feel amends,
> The breath of Heav'n fresh blowing, pure and sweet,
> With day-spring born.

[7]Baum, P. F., *op. cit.*

His keen delight in nature he pathetically recalls:

> Wherever fountain or fresh current flow'd
> Against the eastern ray, translucent, pure,
> With touch ethereal of Heav'ns fiery rod,
> I drank, from the clear milky juice allaying
> Thirst,

and laments his loss of sight as "chief of all":

> Light, the prime work of God, to me extinct,
> And all her various objects of delight
> Annull'd. . . .
> Scarce half I seem to live, dead more than half.

Thus the hero's sensibilities with respect to nature and his fellowmen have been expanded and enriched.

The moral nature of the Nazarite has been distinctly elevated and reinforced. The lust that beset the elder Samson for a time has largely been erased. The Gaza harlots nowhere figure in the play. Unlike the Bible narrative, Milton's story dignifies Dalila with the name of wife. Not lust but love motivates Samson's ill-starred second choice:

> I before all the daughters of my tribe
> And of my nation chose thee from among
> My enemies, lov'd thee, as too well thou knew'st,
> Too well.

The other and primary motivation is made especially clear, as is also his vindication for departing from the law. Samson is under a higher "command" from Heaven to free "his country," and is therefore specifically exempted from observance of the law by Him

> Who made our laws to bind us, not himself;
> And hath full right to exempt
> Whom so it pleases him by choice
> From national obstriction.

Various other moral virtues of the hero Milton establishes beyond the possibility of doubt. Thus as to Samson's patriotism his neighbors testify:

> In seeking just occasion to provoke
> The Philistines, thy country's enemy,
> Thou never wast remiss.

In his public service there has been, says Samson, no taint of selfishness or vanity:

> I on th' other side
> Us'd no ambition to commend my deeds;
> The deeds themselves, though mute, spoke loud the doer.

His temperance and self-control are emphasized and vouched for by the Chorus:

> Desire of wine and all delicious drinks,
> Which many a famous warrior overturns,
> Thou could'st repress; nor did the dancing ruby,
> Sparkling out-pour'd, the flavour, or the smell,
> Or taste that cheers the heart of gods and men,
> Allure thee from the cool crystalline stream.

He is more truthful than his biblical prototype: his cunning shifts to ward off wheedling Dalila, when thrice he

> deluded her, and turn'd to sport
> Her importunity,

are not characterized by Milton, as by Delilah, as mere "lyes." A wholly new and entirely Christian element of forgiveness is introduced when Samson says,

> At distance I forgive thee, go with that.

"Inflexible as steel" is Samson's will to resist evil and to stand for right. Now that the nightmare of his wickedness and weakness is forever past, the temptress finds him

> implacable, more deaf
> To prayers than winds and seas.

The whole absorbing episode of Dalila's visit is invented to demonstrate that where he had been temporarlly weak when he had

> divulg'd the secret gift of God
> To a deceitful woman,

he is now impregnably strong. To the seductive plea of Dalila he retorts:

> Hyæna, . . .
> This jail I count the house of liberty
> To thine, whose doors my feet shall never enter. . . .
> Thy fair enchanted cup, and warbling charms
> No more on me have power, their force is null'd.

She has raised in him "inexpiable hate." The two are "long since twain." There seems to be no real reason to suppose that "Dalila still exerts her former influence over Samson,"[8] that Samson still loves Dalila and therefore is alarmed at her approach. On the contrary, it seems undeniably clear that Milton intends to represent the hero as strong again in will and reason and virtue, as completely disillusioned and permanently cured. The struggle not to love her, if there ever was one, is of the past. Act III is less significant as a portrayal of dramatic struggle than as an exhibition of integrity restored.

Most striking of all, at least in bulk, are the modifications introduced by Milton to expand and to reveal the strictly religious aspects of Samson's character. In words as well as in deeds Samson has become a vindicator of the ways of God to men. Entirely new is his acute perception of his own responsibility for his sin:

> Nothing of these evils hath befall'n me
> But justly; I myself have brought them on;
> Sole author I, sole cause.

His "chief affliction, shame and sorrow" is that he has brought to God and Israel

> Dishonour, obloquy, and op't the mouths
> Of idolists, and atheists; . . . brought scandal
> To Israel, diffidence to God, and doubt
> In feeble hearts.

[8]Curry, W. C., *op. cit.*

This remorse for sin is wholly absent from the Hebrew story, as are also Samson's "swoonings of despair" and "sense of Heav'ns desertion." The despondent hero feels that he is "cast off" as "never known"; like Job he can only hope for "speedy death." New also is the prompt rebound of faith and hope:

> All these . . . evils I deserve, and more;
> Acknowledge them from God inflicted on me
> Justly; yet despair not of the final pardon
> Whose ear is ever open, and his eye
> Gracious to readmit the suppliant. . . .
> My trust is in the living God.

He never doubts that the cause of God will yet prevail. And absorbed in this larger faith and hope, he is less concerned about himself, less vengeful, than the Samson of old; the very human motivation of the elder hero's final plea, "that I may be avenged for my two eyes," Milton wisely blots from the account. The discomfiting of Harapha is an episode invented to exhibit the resuscitation of Samson as the militant and fearless champion of God. His instant response to the "rousing motions" of the Spirit which he now perceives within him is introduced as proof that Samson is again, as he had been before his fall, "full of divine instinct" and obedient to the heavenly voice. With dignity and solemn joy he now can say:

> Be of good courage; I begin to feel
> Some rousing motions in me, which dispose
> To something extraordinary my thoughts.
> I with this messenger will go along. . . .
> Happ'n what may, of me expect to hear
> Nothing dishonourable, impure, unworthy
> Our God, our law, my nation, or myself.

Of Samson's penitence and spiritual recovery there is nothing in the original tale. *Samson Agonistes*, in fact, is largely made of new materials designed to portray the hero's physical, mental, and spiritual restoration. At last, we are emphatically assured,

> Samson hath quit himself
> Like Samson, and heroically hath finished
> A life heroic. . . .
> And which is best and happiest yet, all this
> With God not parted from him as was fear'd,
> But favouring and assisting to the end.

Thus far, in comparing the modern and the ancient conceptions of the central character, I have virtually ignored the fact that Milton's story is a drama and have dealt with the Hebraic and Miltonic narratives as epical accounts. Dramatically considered, however, the protagonist of Milton's tragedy is depicted only in the final period of his recovered strength. Nowhere within the proper limits of the plot, except in reminiscence, is the hero physically, mentally, or spiritually weak. The erroneous conclusion that Samson "has been granted an unwieldy strength of body but impotence of mind and because he lacks wisdom he has been overcome by the weakest of subtleties"[9] springs from a misinterpretation of such lines as these:

> O impotence of mind, in body strong!
> But what is strength, without a double share
> Of wisdom? Vast, unwieldy, burdensome,
> Proudly secure, yet liable to fall
> By weakest subtleties.

Dramatically appropriate as they are, these lines, after all, are Samson's scathing words of self-reproach. The Chorus hastens to supply the juster view:

> Wisest men
> Have err'd, and by bad women been deceived;
> And shall again, pretend they ne'er so wise.
> Deject not, then, so overmuch thyself.

Far-seeing, mighty, temperate, patriotic, self-severe, devout, God's nursling once and choice delight," weak only for a little while, but sincerely penitent, once more loyal, and

[9]Curry, W. C., *op. cit.*

finally victorious in obedience and faith, Samson is presented by Milton as a

> mirror of our fickle state,
> Since man on earth unparallel'd.

If he was occasionally violent and indiscrete, so also was he who walked with God but who in his wrath slew the Egyptian and broke the tables of the law. Samson was indeed susceptible to feminine charm, but never so contemptibly as was Israel's greatest king when he coveted Bathsheba and set her husband in the forefront of the fight. Like Moses and David, Samson as Milton has presented him was essentially God's "faithful champion," who stumbled and fell but who regained his feet and marched steadfastly onward to the accomplishment of his heaven-appointed task.

Retaining, then, as the core of his conception those Hebraic elements of character that render the biblical Samson, despite his temporary weakness, a man of piety and of irresistible power, Milton has beautified, strengthened, and humanized the character of the Nazarite and made of him an heroic figure as conspicuously modern, Christian, and Miltonic as it is Hebraic. In neither version, and much less in the modern than in the ancient account, is there just reason to assert that Samson is a clown, a sensualist, or a dolt. On the contrary, Milton agrees with the deliberate judgment of St. Paul that Samson is of the company of God's heroic men "who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong."

MORE ABOUT DRYDEN AS AN ADAPTER OF SHAKESPEARE

By D. T. Starnes

In the Preface to *All for Love,* Dryden writes: "In my style I have professed to imitate the divine Shakespeare. . . . I hope I need not to explain myself that I have not copied my author servilely. . . . Yet I hope I may affirm, and without vanity, that by imitating him I have excelled myself throughout the play; and particularly that I prefer the scene betwixt Antony and Ventidius in the first act to anything which I have written in this kind."

The implication of this admission, in its context, is that Dryden was imitating his predecessor only in *Antony and Cleopatra.* The Shakespeare *Allusion Book,* however, lists one passage[1] in which *All for Love* obviously echoes *Much Ado About Nothing.* But the authors of the *Allusion Book* take no notice of other passages in Dryden's play which seem to reflect situations, to paraphrase, and, in some instances, to repeat *verbatim* the language of various other plays by Shakespeare, and in particular certain obvious echoes of *Othello.*[2]

In the first act of *All for Love,* for example, there is a scene in which Antony, depressed and melancholy over his defeat in battle, throws himself on the ground, calls for music to "soothe his melancholy," and imagines he is in a shady forest commenting on the herds jumping by him. The similarity in situation and phraseology of this scene to parts of *As You Like It,* in which the melancholy Jaques, in the forest of Arden, moralizes on the fate of the wounded stag, and grows sentimental over Amiens' song, is, I think, fairly

---

[1]See *All for Love,* IV, 293–298, and *Much Ado About Nothing,* III, ii, 107–111.

[2]See the article by Professor T. P. Harrison, Jr., "Othello as a Model for Dryden in *All for Love,*" *Studies in English,* No. 7, pp. 136–143.

obvious. For illustration of this agreement, compare the following lines:

All for Love	*As You Like It*
Ant. . . . Stay I fancy I'm now turned wild, a commoner of nature, Of all forsaken and forsaking all; Live in a shady forest's sylvan scene, *Stretched at my length beneath some blasted oak;* *. . . a murm'ring brook* *Runs at my foot. . . .* (I, 231–240.)	The First Lord, speaking to Duke Senior concerning the melancholy Jaques, says: . . . Today my Lord of Amiens and myself Did steal behind him as *he lay along* *Under an oak whose antique root peeps out* *Upon the brook that brawls along this wood. . . .* (II, i, 29–32.)
Ventidius comes and weeps over Antony. The latter exclaims: By heav'n, he weeps, poor good old man—he weeps! *The big round drops chase one another down* *The furrows of his cheeks.* *(Ibid.*, 266–268.)	To the stream near Jaques came a wounded stag, . . . And *the big round tears* *Cours'd one another down his innocent nose* *In piteous chase;* and thus the hairy fool, Much marked of the melancholy Jaques. . . . *(Ibid.*, 28–43.)
The *herd comes jumping by me* And, fearless, quench their thirst, while I look on, And *take me for their fellow-citizen.* *More of this image; more;* it lulls my thoughts (soft music). *(Ibid.*, 241–244.)	Anon a careless herd, Full of the pasture, *jumps along by him* And never stays to greet him. "Ay," quoth Jaques, "Sweep on, you *fat and greasy citizens.* 'Tis just the fashion. . . . *(Ibid.*, 52–56.)
Antony, having thrown himself on the ground, says:	In the fifth scene of the second act Amiens sings. At the close of the song, Jaques says:

Give me *some music;* look that *it*
be sad.
I'll *soothe my melancholy,* till I
swell
And burst myself with sighing,—
(soft music).
'Tis somewhat to my humor.
(Ibid., 228–231.)

More, more, I prithee more,

Amiens. It will make you melancholy, monsieur Jaques.

Jaques. I thank it. More, I
prithee, more.
(II, v, 10–12.)

It is somewhat surprising to find in *All for Love* definite echoes of *As You Like It,* so different are the *dramatis personae* and the subject matter of these two plays. The imitation in this case is limited to one scene in Dryden's play; and the melancholy of Antony seems to be genuine, though temporary, in contrast with the habitual, but affected, melancholy of Jaques.

Much less surprising are the reflections of *Julius Caesar.* It seems quite natural that, in preparing to write *All for Love,* the author should have studied *Julius Caesar*—at least for Shakespeare's conception of Mark Antony—as well as *Antony and Cleopatra.* Whether or not this was Dryden's procedure, his *All for Love* reveals both in situation and in phraseology striking similarities to *Julius Caesar.* For example, the first thirty lines of Dryden's play, giving an account of portents and prodigies ominous of tragedy, suggest at once similar passages in *Julius Caesar.*[3] The references, in common, to violent storms, to the dead rising from their tombs, and to gliding ghosts lend color to this suggestion. The circumstance, too, that this foreshadowing employed by Dryden is not as much in tone with the subsequent action as are similar passages in *Julius Caesar* leads one to wonder whether Dryden did not have fresh in memory lines of this play when he began the composition of *All for Love.* Further investigation affords support for this theory. Compare the following excerpts:

---

[3]*Cf. All for Love,* I, 1–31, and *Julius Caesar,* I, iii, 5–10; 15–27; 63–65; 73–75, and II, ii, 15–24.

Cf. also, *Hamlet,* I, i, 112–120.

All for Love

Serap. . . . While Antony stood
firm, our Alexandria
Rivalled proud Rome (dominion's
other seat),
And Fortune, *striding like a vast
Colossus,*
Could fix an equal foot of empire
here.

Alex. Had I my wish, these tyrants of all nature
Who lord it o'er mankind, **should**
perish—**perish**
Each by the other's sword.
(I, 67–73.)

Announcing Cleopatra's orders to celebrate Antony's birthday with pomps and triumphs, Serapion says:

. . . Set out before your doors
*The images of all your sleeping
fathers,*
With laurels crowned, with laurels wreathe your poets,
And *strew with flowers the pavement;* let the priests
Do present sacrifice; pour out the
wine,
And call the gods to join with you
in gladness.

Ventidius rebukes the would-be celebrants:

Can they be friends of Antony
who revel
When Antony's in danger?
Hide for shame,
You Romans, *your great grandsire's images,*
For fear their souls should animate their marbles,
To blush at their degenerate
progeny.
(I, 144–155.)

Julius Caesar

Cassius. Why, man, he doth *bestride the narrow world*
Like a Colossus, and we petty men
Walk under his huge legs, and
peep about
To find ourselves dishonorable
graves.

[Cassius's desire is, of course, that Caesar should perish.]
(I, ii, 135–138.)

Julius Caesar opens with an account of Flavius and Marullus, tribunes, rebuking the plebeians for celebrating a triumph of Caesar.

Cob. . . . But indeed, sir, we
make holiday to see Caesar
and to rejoice in his triumph.

Reproving the commoners for their ingratitude to Pompey, Marullus says:

And do you now call out a holiday?
And do you now *strew flowers in
his way*
That comes in triumph over
Pompey's blood?
Be gone!
Run to your houses, fall upon
your knees,
Pray to the gods to intermit the
plague
That needs must light on this ingratitude.

After the mob has dispersed, Flavius orders:

. . . *Disrobe the images*
If you do find them decked with ceremonies. . . .
It is no matter; *let no images*
Be hung with Caesar's trophies.
I'll about
And drive away the vulgar from the streets.
(I, i, 53–75.)

After defeat in battle, Antony says:

They tell me 'tis my birthday, and I'll keep it
With double pomp of sadness.
'Tis what the day deserves which gave me breath.
(I, 203–205.)

Believing all was lost in battle, Cassius says:

This day I breathed first: time is come round,
And where I did begin, there shall I end;
My life is run his compass.
(V, iii, 23–25.)

As an example of similarity of imagery and of further probable indebtedness of Dryden to his predecessor, notice the following passages:

All for Love

Ant. . . .
For I am now so much sunk from what I was,
Thou find'st me at my lowest watermark.
The *rivers that ran in and raised my fortunes*
Are all dried up, or take another course.
What I have left is from my native spring;
I've still a heart that swells in scorn of fate
And lifts me to by banks.
(III, 128–134.)

Julius Caesar

Brut. . . .
We, at the height, are ready to decline.
There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, *taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;*
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is *bound in shallows* and in miseries.
On such a full sea are we now afloat;
And we must take the current when it serves,
Or lose our ventures.
(IV, III, 217–224.)

Ventidius praises Antony in these words:

But you, ere love misled your wondering eyes,
Were sure the chief and *best of human race,*
Framed in the very pride and boast of nature;
So perfect that the gods *who formed you,* wondered
At their own skill, and cried "A lucky hit
Has mended our design."
(I, 403–408.)

Antony's well-known eulogy of Brutus is, in part, as follows:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him that *Nature might stand up*
And say to all the world, "This was a man."
(V, v, 73–75.)

Besides *As You Like It* and *Julius Caesar,* three other Shakespearean plays (to say nothing of *Antony and Cleopatra)* seem to be echoed in *All for Love.* These are *Hamlet, Macbeth,* and *Othello.* Compare the following:

All for Love

The dying Antony urges his staunch friend, Ventidius, who threatens to kill himself, to live and defend Antony's name.

Wilt thou not live to speak some good of me?
To stand by my fair fame, and guard th' approaches
From the ill tongues of men?
(V, 300–302.)

Hamlet

Facing death, Hamlet wrests from his good friend, Horatio, the poisonous cup, and urges him to live to report Hamlet's "cause aright."

. . . Horatio, I am dead;
Thou *liv'st. Report me and my cause aright*
To the unsatisfied. . . .
O good Horatio, what a wounded name,
Things standing thus unknown, shall live behind me!
If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart,
Absent thee from felicity a while
And in *this harsh world draw thy breath in pain*
To tell my story. . . .
(V, ii, 349–360.)

The passage below from *All for Love* somewhat vaguely suggests the language of *Macbeth:*

All for Love

And, like a scorpion, whipped by others first
To fury, sting yourself in mad revenge.
I would *bring balm and pour it in your wounds,*
Cure your distempered mind, and heal your fortunes.
(I, 314–317.)

Macbeth

. . . *Cure her of that.*
Canst thou not minister to a mind diseas'd
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
And with some sweet oblivious antidote
Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart?
(V, III, 39–45.)

The similarities in situation and phraseology between *All for Love* and plays of Shakespeare other than *Antony and Cleopatra* seem to indicate that Dryden's imitation of his predecessor was more extensive than Dryden himself admitted.

WHO WAS "OUTIS"?

By Killis Campbell

In her recently published *Edgar Allan Poe—the Man*, a work of interest to every student of Poe, Miss Mary E. Phillips advances the ingenious theory[1] that Poe's protagonist in the notorious "Longfellow War,"[2] the writer of an article in defense of Longfellow published in the New York *Evening Mirror* for March 1, 1845,[3] and signed "Outis," was, in reality, none other than Poe himself,—in other words, that the article by "Outis" was a hoax conceived and perpetrated by Poe in an effort to advertise himself and advance his interests in the literary world.

Miss Phillips argues in support of her theory that Poe was exceedingly fond of hoaxing, and, further, that he was not above log-rolling on his own account. She holds also that Poe indulged in other literary hoaxes of a similar character, and in particular she instances a mysterious article entitled "A Reviewer Reviewed" and directed against Poe, a paper long preserved in manuscript but published in the New York *Journal* of March 15, 1896,[4] which she believes to have proceeded in like fashion from Poe, although it purports to be the work of one "Walter G. Bowen."

Miss Phillips is right, of course, in holding that Poe was fond of hoaxing, and she is right, too, in declaring that Poe at times stooped to literary log-rolling when he felt that his interests were at stake. But I am not convinced that she is right in identifying Poe with "Outis"; indeed, it seems to me extremely improbable that Poe would have attempted a hoax of this sort. There is nothing, so far as I

---

[1]Phillips, Mary E., *Edgar Allan Poe—the Man*, Philadelphia, 1926, II, pp. 956 ff.

[2]Begun in the *Evening Mirror* of January 13, 1845, and continued in a series of papers in the *Mirror* during the next two months and in the *Broadway Journal* during March and April, 1845. See Poe's *Works*, ed. Harrison, New York, 1902, XII, pp. 41 ff.

[3]Republished in the *Weekly Mirror* of March 8, 1845.

[4]Reprinted by Miss Phillips, II, pp. 961 ff.

can see, either in the paper by "Outis" or in Poe's replies, that suggests insincerity or ungenuineness, nor yet in Willis's editorial notes dissenting from Poe's criticisms.[5] Besides, it seems to me altogether unlikely that the secret would not somehow have leaked out long ago if the "Outis" paper had actually been written by Poe,—and especially so if, as Miss Phillips suggests, both Willis and Longfellow were privy to the facts as she sees them.[6] Furthermore, Poe would, I believe, have been much chagrined if any hoax of his had not been pretty promptly recognized as such; and I wonder if he would not have made a point of giving the secret away. The style, moreover, of "Outis's" paper, though simple and forthright, lacks the nervousness and the dash of Poe's polemic writing.[7] Finally, it remains to be shown that Poe was the author of the article "A Reviewer Reviewed," purporting to have been written by Walter G. Bowen. I am aware that so able an authority on Poe as Professor George E. Woodberry has expressed the opinion that the manuscript of this article is in Poe's handwriting,[8] but it does not follow that a manuscript in Poe's handwriting is necessarily of his own composition. There are, indeed, at least two articles—or scraps of manuscript—preserved in Poe's handwriting that we know are not his work; namely, a copy of Harriet Winslow's lines "To the Author of the 'Raven' "[9] (republished as it happens, in facsimile, in the New York *Journal* of March 15, 1896, on the same page with "A Reviewer Reviewed") and an excerpt from one of Mrs. Osgood's dramas published not long after Poe's

---

[5]In the *Evening Mirror* of February 5 and 14, 1845 (also in the *Weekly Mirror* of February 8 and 22, respectively).

[6]*L.c.*, p. 968.

[7]"Outis's" article may be conveniently consulted in the first of Poe's articles in reply to it, in which it is reproduced in its entirety (Harrison, XII, pp. 46 f.).

[8]New York *Journal*, March 15, 1896.

[9]See the New York *Times Saturday Review* for November 27 and December 18, 1909.

death as a bit of verse from his pen.[10] I ought to add that the name "Walter G. Bowen" does not appear in the New York directories for the forties; but neither does Poe's name appear there, although we know he was living either in New York City or in Fordham from April, 1844, to the year of his death.

"Outis" was, I suspect—though I have no way of establishing this conclusively—Longfellow's close friend and colleague, C. C. Felton, Professor of Greek at Harvard and later president of the University. Felton was at the time of Poe's attacks collaborating with Longfellow on his *Poets and Poetry of Europe* (Philadelphia, 1845)[11] and doubtless saw the poet daily. It was Felton, too, as Miss Phillips indeed notes,[12] who came to Longfellow's defense when attacked in *The Rover* early in 1845. On the other hand, there is one bit of evidence running counter to my theory: in the statement made by C. F. Briggs in a letter to Lowell of March 16, 1845, that he had forgotten who "Outis" was.[13] Hence I readily grant that the evidence at hand is not sufficient to warrant the unqualified conclusion that "Outis" was Felton. But we can be reasonably certain, in my judgment, that "Outis" was not Poe.

---

[10]In *Autograph Leaves of our Country's Authors*, compiled by John Pendleton Kennedy and Alexander Bliss, Baltimore, 1864. Probably originally a part of the manuscript of Poe's article on Mrs. Osgood published in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for August, 1849; see Poe's *Works*, ed. Harrison, XV, p. 277.

[11]Longfellow, S., *Life of Longfellow*, Boston, 1896, II, p. 4.

[12]*L.c.*, p. 973.

[13]Woodberry, G. E., *Life of Poe*, Boston, 1909, II, p. 127.

SOME NINETEENTH CENTURY CRITICS OF REALISM

By Houghton W. Taylor

The beginning of the work involved in this paper lay in a plan to study the development in England and America of general critical concepts of modern literary realism. It was, and still is, my hope to make this study exhaustive. The present discussion, however, is concerned with a relatively small body of documents—specifically, with a group of magazine articles published between 1875 and 1900, with the aid of which group I intend simply to set forth in broad outline the ideas and attitudes that prevailed toward realism during that quarter-century. Two articles of 1874 have been included as belonging, in effect, to this period. I have also made a somewhat less thorough study of magazines as far back as 1850, but have not found evidence of any great wealth of material. It was during the last quarter of the nineteenth century that realism came to have an important place in English critical literature. Books on the subject, to be sure, were and still are scarce in the corpus of that literature; but contributions to magazines were sufficiently plentiful. By going through the bound volumes of several important journals, I have gathered what I believe to be a representative group of opinions, reasonably safe to base my conclusions on. My principal effort has been to classify; but I have frequently ventured to evaluate also, where I thought I could promote the clearness of the discussion by the application of critical judgments generally accepted by students of realism.

The magazines consulted in this study were as follows:

Academy, LV–LXXXIX (1898–1915).
Arena, IX (1893).
Athenaeum, Nos. 2462–3270 (1875–1890).
Atlantic Monthly, I–CXXXIV (1857–1924).
Citizen, I (1895).
Contemporary Review, I–CXXIV (1866–1923).

Dial, XVIII–LXXVI (1895–1924).
Edinburgh Review, I–CCXL (1803–1924).
Fortnightly Review, I–CXXI (1865–1924).
Forum, I–LXIX (1886–1923).
Harper's Monthly, L–LXXXI (1874–1890).
Journal of English and Germanic Philology, I–XXIII (1897–1924).
Lippincott's Magazine, XIII (1874), XLVIII (1891).
Living Age, CXXIV–CLXXXVII (1875–1890).
Modern Language Notes, I–XXXIX (1886–1924).
Modern Language Review, I–XIX (1905–1924).
New Englander, L (1889).
New Republic, I–XXXVII (1914–1924).
Nineteenth Century, XXV (1889), XXXIV (1893).
Publications of the Modern Language Association, I–XLII (1893–1927).
Quarterly Review, XLI–CXC (1829–1899), CCXXXV–CCXLI (1921–1924).
Scribner's Magazine, II (1887).
Southern Literary Messenger, I–XXX (1834–1864).
Westminster Review, CXXIX (1888), CXXXII (1889), CXXXIV (1890), CXLI (1894).

It will be seen that my reading has covered considerable ground outside of the period in which I was primarily interested. Even within the period, moreover, I found many articles which, though valuable in a general way, did not, for various reasons, suit my purpose precisely. In particular, I have not referred in this paper to any articles that criticise novels without reference to general theory. Such articles may be sometimes significant in their very omission of theoretical matter. For example, Ernest Newman writes a first-rate appreciation[1] of Flaubert, discussing that novelist's art with notable adequacy, but scarcely referring to realism at all. But though Newman may thus warn us against dwelling too long on theories of method, the need for concentration forces me to neglect such articles as his.

For convenience in classifying, I have seen fit to make two main time-divisions in my discussion. The first is the period 1875–1890, when the main lines of thought were established; the second is 1890–1900, when these lines were extended, and subsidiary lines appeared.

[1]Art. 1. "Gustave Flaubert," *Fortnightly Review,* LXIV (1895), 813 ff.

The excerpts and paraphrases which follow are not in general to be regarded as indicating the whole content of the articles involved. The matter of the combination and interaction of critical notions in any one article, contains possible complexities which I have not intended to analyze. All the reader needs to see, for the purpose of this paper, is the appearance of the essential ideas which constitute the frame for all others.

I. 1875–1890

The realism of Flaubert made some impression on English readers, but it was not until after the appearance of the naturalistic novels of the Goncourts and Zola that one could have observed great manifestations of concern. *Renée Mauperin* appeared in 1864, *Germinie Lacerteux* in the following year; *Therèse Raquin,* Zola's first venture in naturalism, was published in 1867, While *L'Assommoir,* his first really notorious novel, did not appear until 1877. A glance at these dates will make it seem reasonable that not many articles on realism should have appeared before the seventies. As a matter of fact, as late as 1883 a writer in the *Fortnightly Review*[2] could say with truth that there was not much critical material in England on the theories and aims of modern fiction. But even as he spoke, the defect was being remedied; the contribution of the period of 1875–1890, looked at in retrospect, seems of creditable size. Adverse criticism was more frequent and more characteristic than its opposite; with it, therefore, it would be logical to begin.

A. Adverse Criticism

The general tone of the adverse criticism will be familiar to anyone who has spent much time reading modern novels and discussions of them. The lines of attack were in the main as follows:

---

[2]Art. 2. Norman, Henry: "Theories and Practice of Modern Fiction," *Fortnightly Review,* XL (1883), 870 ff.

1. Realism is foul, indecent, etc. It talks of things that should never be mentioned in literature or in polite circles. It contaminates the mind of the reader.
2. Realism distorts life, because it takes the unpleasant as being the whole of life, or at any rate neglects to treat the pleasant in due proportion.
3. Realism is inartistic. It is incompatible with beauty, because it is too close to reality, or because it does not idealise.

1. REALISM IS FOUL

The first of these varieties of attack, though found during all periods of realism, including the present, I do not find very frequently by itself. Usually the critic joins this attack with one of the second or third sort. The state of extreme revulsion is clearly illustrated in such excerpts as the following:

Art. 3. Haggard, H. Rider: "About Fiction," *Contemporary Review*, LI (1887), 172 ff. The author calls realism "an accursed thing."

Art. 4. "Editor's Literary Record," *Harper's Monthly*, LIX (1879), 309:

> "Of *L'Assommoir*, the less said the better. . . . [Its] atmosphere [is] loaded with moral contagion. . . . [It is] lifelike, but so would be the reproduction of a cancerous sore or a scrofulous ulcer."

Art. 5. Lilly, W. S.: "The Age of Balzac," *Contemporary Review*, XXXVII (1880), 1004 ff.:

> "Balzac is a realist, if you will; but a realist in quite another sense from that in which the epithet applies to certain writers of the present day, who seek in his great name a sanction for their coarse studies from the shambles and latrines of human nature."

See also:

Art. 6. Perry, Thomas Sargent: "Zola's Last Novel," *Atlantic Monthly*, XLV (1880), 693 ff.

Art. 7. "Novelists," *Living Age*, CXLI (1879), 90 ff.; copied from *Blackwood's*.

Art. 8. Lilly, W. S.: "The New Naturalism," *Fortnightly Review*, XLIV (1885), 240 ff.

Art. 9. Lang, Andrew: "Emile Zola," *Fortnightly Review*, XXXVII (1882), 439 ff.

2. REALISM DISTORTS LIFE

Why, is the complaint, must fiction concentrate on what is unpleasant? By doing so, it distorts life, for life is a mixture of good and bad things, and a well-balanced work of art (one would conclude) should present the good and bad together. Whether non-realistic art generally does any such thing as this, is another question; at any rate, distortion of life has never ceased to be an item in the charges against realism.

Art. 10. Asheton, Francis: "Modern French Fiction," *Lippincott's Magazine,* XIII (1874), 237 ff.: The author complains that the realists fail in proportion, their view of life is distorted. "Honesty and truth are banished from the picture as unreal and visionary." The author does not think that such a large group of base creatures could be found together in life as Flaubert puts into *Madame Bovary.*

Art. 11. "Zola," in the "Contributor's Club," *Atlantic Monthly,* XXXIX (1877), 610: In describing life we must "make our account" with its foulness. But Zola, says this author, "deals with foul things from the foul point of view." The fault of Zola and his school is their failure to see that "delicacy is a positive factor in a real work of art."

Art. 12. "Realism and Decadence in French Fiction," *Quarterly Review,* CLXXI (1890), 59 ff.: The author says of Balzac, Flaubert, Zola, that "they explain human nature . . . by resolving its highest faculties into brute appetites." Their modus operandi was to present the *abnormal,* especially when dealing with passion. The "first great principle" of realism "is the essential bestiality of man as the supreme utterance of the mouth of knowledge."

Art. 13. Lang, Andrew: "Emile Zola," *Fortnightly Review,* XXXVII (1882), 439 ff.:

> "We must presume that M. Zola and most other French *naturalistes* are unable, through an unhappy temperament, to see much of things and people 'lovely and of good report,' and are compelled 'to lose themselves in human corruption.' . . . Even if we grant to M. Zola that the object of the art of fiction is 'the scientific knowledge of man,' we fail to see why that knowledge should dwell so much on man's corruption, and so little on the nobler aspects of humanity."[3]

---

[3] *Cf.* art. 30.

See also:

Art. 14. "Realism of the Beautiful," in the "Contributor's Club," *Atlantic Monthly,* XL (1877), 368.
Art. 15. "Contributor's Club," *Atlantic Monthly,* LX (1887), 572.
Art. 16. Lang, Andrew: "Realism and Romance," *Contemporary Review,* LII (1887) 683 ff.
Art. 17. Review of Zola's *La Bête Humaine, Westminster Review,* CXXXIV (1890), 87 ff.
Art. 18. Mallock, W. H.: "The Relation of Art to Truth," *Forum,* IX (1890), 36 ff.
Art. 19. "French Novels," *Living Age,* CXLII (1879), 67 ff.; copied from *Blackwood's.*

3. REALISM IS INARTISTIC

The aesthetic problems raised by English critics, in the course of their objections to realism, are so various that any attempt to explain them here would make the paper cumbersome indeed. I shall do no more than set forth the content of the articles.

Art. 20. Bates, Arlo: "Realism and the Art of Fiction," *Scribner's Magazine,* II (1887), 241 ff.:

> "Realism concerns itself with how human nature appears; art, with what it is. It is the accidental versus the essential. . . . Realism rejects aesthetic emotion. . . . The realistic writer is untrue in that he stands in an objective mood toward his characters. . . . It is necessary to apprehend the mood of the speaker, and that, too, in the most intimately subjective way. . . . The fatal error of regarding the surface as more real than what lies below is common enough; art should correct, not foster, this mistake."

Art. 21. Wilde, Oscar: "The Decay of Lying," *Nineteenth Century,* XXV (1889), 35 ff.: This once famous dialogue might deserve a large space in this paper on account of its merits as a rhetorical feat; but as these merits would certainly disappear in my reproduction of Wilde's arguments, all I shall do is to state the four doctrines which the dialogue sets forth to define true art and refute realism. They are:

(1) Art never expresses anything but itself.
(2) All bad art comes from returning to life and nature, and elevating them into ideals.

(3) Life imitates Art far more than Art imitates Life.

(4) Lying, the telling of beautiful untrue things, is the proper aim of Art.

Art. 22. Thompson, Maurice: "The Domain of Romance," *Forum*, VIII (1889), 326 ff.: The author says, with enthusiasm, that all art that is of any value is romantic. Balzac, for example, is romantic; but Tolstoy, it appears, is only a realist, and not an artist at all. "The realists, in defining their own area, concede to romance the domain it rightfully occupies. Photography is realism; everything else is romance."[4]

Art. 23. "Realism in Art," in the "Contributor's Club," *Atlantic Monthly*, XLVII (1881), 430 ff.: We should expect that sooner or later someone would try to catch the realists with a quibble about the real versus the actual. This author, beginning with the Platonic principle that there is for every living species a perfect type or ideal which is a truer reality than the individual coming under the type, concludes that the artist who has a true conception of this ideal has the right to call the creations of his imagination made after the image of this ideal truth, realities.[5] Since Platonic realities are much to be preferred to social or biologic ones, it is evident that realism is by so much inferior.

Art. 24. Warner, Charles Dudley: "Modern Fiction," *Atlantic Monthly*, LI (1883), 464 ff.: The topic sentence seems to be this: "One of the worst characteristics of modern fiction is its so-called truth to nature." All the usual objections to realism are rehearsed. But not content with the usual, the author goes to the length of demanding that the novel have the perfection and conclusiveness of plot which characterize classic tragedy, and better still, pleads for ideal characters and poetic justice.

See also:

Art. 25. "Contributor's Club," *Atlantic Monthly*, XLI (1878), 130.

Art. 26. Hillebrand, Karl: "About Old and New Novels," *Contemporary Review*, XLV (1884), 388 ff.

Art. 27. Quilter, Harry: "The Tendencies of French Art," *Contemporary Review*, LI (1887), 863 ff.

---

[4]Presumably a shot at Zola.

[5]Of course, the realists mean by the "real" merely the actual, so that all this Platonism is beside the point.

Art. 28. Caine, Hall: "The New Watchwords of Fiction," *Contemporary Review,* LVII (1890), 479 ff.
Art. 29. Lee, Vernon: "A Dialogue on Novels," *Contemporary Review,* XLVII (1885), 378 ff.

B. Favorable and Neutral Criticism

In the midst of this flurry of objection and abuse, calmer voices were to be heard. Though there was little positive enthusiasm over the extreme practices of the French naturalists, appreciation of continental realism in the large was far from being non-existent. The articles may be classified as follows:

1. Articles on general theory.
   a. Impersonalism.
   b. The Realism-Idealism Distinction.
2. Historico-theoretical Articles.

1. ARTICLES ON GENERAL THEORY

a. Impersonalism

It will hardly be necessary to explain what impersonalism is, or to explain that it was neither tenable in theory nor followed in practice. How far from being really impersonal the Flaubert method was, has been explained once for all by Maupassant, in the Preface to *Pierre et Jean.*[6] Zola's adaptation of the theory, with scientific ramifications, was

[6]"Quel enfantillage, d'ailleurs, de croire à la réalité puisque nous portons chacun la nôtre dans notre pensée et dans nos organes. Nos yeux, nos oreilles, notre odorat, notre goûts différents créent autant de vérités qu'il y a d'hommes sur la terre. Et nos esprits qui reçoivent les instructions de ces organes, diversement impressionés, comprennent, analysent, et jugent comme si chacun de nous appartenait à une autre race. . . . Chacun de nous se fait donc simplement une illusion du monde, illusion poétique, sentimentale, joyeuse, mélancholique, sale ou lugubre suivant sa nature. Et l'écrivain n'a d'autre mission que de reproduire fidélement cette illusion aves tous les procédés d'art qu'il a appris et dont il peut disposer. . . . Ne nous fâchons donc contre aucune théorie puisque chacune d'elles est simplement l'expression généralisée d'un tempérament qui s'analyse." From *Pierre et Jean,* Preface, p. xv., in *Oeuvres Complétes de Guy de Maupassant,* Paris, 1909.

equally far removed from reality, and its high-handed assertions met with prompt and vigorous disapproval. It is easy enough to point out Zola's errors, as the first of the following articles will show.

Art. 30. Marzials, Frank T.: "Zola as a critic," *Contemporary Review,* LI (1887), 57 ff.: The author finds in Zola's *Mes Haines* the statement that "a work of art is a corner of nature seen through the medium of a temperament," and proceeds to beat him to death with it. Temperament is the key to Zola's art; his scientific detachment is not to be discovered. But matters are even worse than this, for Zola's temperament leads him to see only the beast in man. Edmond Goncourt suggested that the methods of realism might be applied to the study of the upper classes as well as the lower, so that there might be a realism of a better world than Zola's. Zola replied:

"Where are we to find that better world? . . . If we are curious, if we look through the keyholes, I suspect that we shall see in the higher classes exactly what we saw in the people, for the human animal is the same everywhere."

Art. 31. James, Henry: "Guy de Maupassant, "*Fortnightly Review,* XLIX (1883), 364 ff.: This article is one of the best short studies on realism ever written by an English-speaking author. It is mainly concerned with the preface to *Pierre et Jean,* referred to above, and James' absorption with Maupassant's views is to be seen in such sentences as these:

"There are simply as many different kinds [of fiction] as there are persons practicing the art, for if a picture, a tale, or a novel is a direct impression of life (and that surely is its interest and value), the impression will vary according to the plate that takes it. . . . Our author . . . says that any form of the novel is simply a vision of the world from the standpoint of a person constituted after a certain fashion and that it is absurd to say that there is, for the novelist's use, only one reality of things."[7]

Art. 32. Moore, George: "Turgueneff," *Fortnightly Review,* XLIX (1888), 237 ff.:

---

[7]The concluding paragraph of this article should be read by those who are inclined to object to realism in general.

"The impersonality of the artist is the vainest of delusions; Flaubert dreamed of it all his life, but Madame Bovary, with the little pessimistic flip at the end of every paragraph, is the most personal of books. . . . Whether the writer should intrude his idea on the reader, or hide it away and leave it latent in the work, is a question of method; and all methods are good. What I wish to establish here is that it is a vain and fruitless task to narrate any fact unless it has been tempered and purified in thought and stamped by thought with a specific value."

See also:

Art. 33. Lathrop, G. P.: "The Growth of the Novel," *Atlantic Monthly,* XXXIII (1874), 684 ff.

b. The Realism-Idealism Distinction

Is there, after all, any such thing as realism? Or is not realism simply another variety of the idealizing process in art? There will always be those who will answer no and yes respectively to these questions.

Art. 34. Pellew, George: "The New Battle of the Books," *Forum,* V (1888), 564 ff.: The author argues that absolute lack of realism is never observed in fiction of any value, any more than absolute lack of imagination. The actual value, however, says he, of any fiction is that it puts forth in some way a true picture of human feelings. Hence realism and romanticism are identical in purpose, and however much they may seem to disagree, the disagreement is not fundamental.

This writer tosses realism and romance together somewhat indiscriminately. A less usual and more penetrating answer to the above question is given in the next article.

Art. 35. Firkins, Oscar W.: "The Commonplace in Fiction," *New Englander,* L (1889), 333 ff.: This piece is of especial interest in that it sets forth (for the first time in English criticism, as far as I know) the notion that realism is not basically the opposite of romanticism, but has, indeed, a romanticism peculiar to itself. Says Firkins, the commonplace has superseded the marvelous in modern art; but the commonplace has marvels of its own.[8] Not familiar

[8]See art. 59.

truths, but new truths about familiar subjects, is the aim of realism. Moreover, the principle of the commonplace does not deny the value of the rare and the novel, as means of adornment in art. Realism, then, may contain two kinds of romanticism—the ordinary kind as well as its own distinctive variety.

See also:

Art. 36. Symonds, John Addington: "Realism and Idealism," *Fortnightly Review*, XLVIII (1887), 418 ff.

2. HISTORICO-THEORETICAL ARTICLES

Art. 37. "Zola's Essays," a short review, *Atlantic Monthly*, XLVII (1881), 116: This review points out the weaknesses of Zola's ideas, from his misapplication of Claude Bernard's observations on medical science, through his disapproval of the French concern for style, to his vastly exaggerated notion of his own greatness.

Art. 38. Sully, James: "The Future of Fiction," *Forum*, IX (1890), 644 ff.: Says Sully, modern life demands concreteness of the novel. The realistic novel supplies this concreteness. But it also serves the ideal by artistic exaggeration of the real, or by illuminating analysis of the real. Modern fiction, moreover, has broadened the scope of moral reflection in art. This puts the case rather strongly for realism, though the reader may be somewhat bewildered on observing that the author's favorites are Scott, Hugo, Dickens, and strangely, Tolstoi.

Art. 39. Gosse, Edmund: "The Limits of Realism," *Forum*, IX (1890), 391 ff.: This article comes in a fortunate position chronologically, for the year 1890 may be said roughly to mark the beginning of the decline of naturalism in France. Gosse's summary of the whole situation is so satisfying as to make it worth while to give an abstract of the article, instead of excerpts.

The author is "tired to death" of the critics English and American who refuse to see what the realists are.

Ten years ago (1880) the naturalist school was just beginning to be talked about. Even now, only George Moore's clever but imperfect short stories are direct English developments of naturalism.

In 1880 Zola, in *Le Roman Experimental*, drove from people's minds all doubts as to what he conceived naturalism to be.

Zola alone has concentrated the scattered tendencies of realism, and drawn together the threads of Flaubert and Daudet, Dostoiefsky and Tolstoi, Howells and Henry James.

Zola's theory starts from the negation of fancy, not of imagination.

There is no harm in the theory. Indeed, English fiction, in Richardson, Fielding, Jane Austen, is as experimental as one could expect.

It is not true that realists see nothing but filth and crime; nevertheless, there are weak points in their practice.

Naturalism as the Revealer and Avenger has not progressed as Zola expected, but is actually less advanced in 1890 than it was in 1880.

The first principle of the school, exact reproduction of life, has not worked perfectly; attempts to reproduce large sections of life have resulted in exactness of some parts and distortion of others.

The disinterested attitude (the second principle of the school) has induced Continental writers into a contemplation of crime and frailty, and American writers into insipidity.

The disciples, in pushing the theory to its limit, have eliminated too much of art.

Naturalism is not a canker destroying literature; it is a natural and timely growth, and like other growths, subject to decay. In fact, it is even now decaying. But it has had a great and beneficial influence.

It has driven out forever the old "well-made" plot and the devices of old romance.

The younger French writers, however, are now escaping from the realistic formula. Maupassant is a psychologist; Huysmans, a mystic; Bourget, ingenious, musky, never a realist; Loti, a romancer. The new school of novelists will have as part of their formula a concession to the human instinct for mystery and beauty.

See also:

Art. 40. "Belles Lettres" section, *Westminster Review,* CXXIX (1888), 538.

Art. 41. "Naturalism," *Westminster Review,* CXXXII (1889), 185 ff.

II. 1890–1900

I have said that the period from 1890 to 1900 shows a continuation of the previous main lines of criticism. Exclamations of horror persisted, though now reduced to murmurs. Protests against distortion of life were still heard

The attention of the critics, however, seems to have centered upon the following group of points, of which the first one is new, the others being continuations from the storm and stress of the eighties.

A. The Revival of Romance.
  1. As welcomed by some.
  2. As ignored by others.

B. Realism as Bad Art.

C. Impersonalism.

D. The Realism-Idealism Question.

A. The Revival of Romance

1. As Welcomed by Some

The decline of naturalism and return of fantasy and subjectivism in French literature, referred to in the last paragraph of the abstract of Article 39, had their counterpart in English literature as well. A new cry is heard in the English magazines during the 1890's, that romance has returned.

Art. 42. Thayer, William R.: "The New Story-Tellers and the Doom of Realism," *Forum,* XVIII (1894), 470 ff.: Thayer playfully calls the realists the Epidermists, and takes Zola's theories of scientific method as a true description of the practice of realism.

Art. 43. Axson, Stockton: "The New Romanticism," *Citizen,* I (1895), 60 ff.: The writer praises Stevenson, Kipling, etc., at the expense of the "morbid prurience" of realism; admitting, however, that realism has taught authors truth of characterization, which the older romanticists, even Scott, did not always understand.

Art. 44. Anderson, Margaret S.: "A New Ideal in American Fiction," *Dial,* XXIII (1897), 269 ff.: A new romanticism based on heroic ideas has arisen in the United States, in the work of Gilbert Parker, Mrs. Catherwood, and others, and in *The Choir Invisible.* This new fiction can "arouse the emotions and cheer the soul."

Art. 45. "The Revival of Romance," an editorial, *Dial,* XXV (1898), 387 ff.: The editor enthusiastically proclaims the arrival of a new romanticism which is "carrying literature before it," through the abilities of such persons as Rostand, Sienkiewicz, D'Annunzio, Hauptmann, and Ibsen minus his realistic plays.

See also:

Art. 46. DeBury, Yetta Blaze: "Idealism in Recent French Fiction," *Fortnightly Review*, LIII (1890), 552 ff.

2. As Ignored by Others

Art. 47. Darrow, Clarence: "Realism in Literature and Art," *Arena*, IX (1893), 98 ff.:

"The world has grown tired of preachers and sermons; today it asks for facts. It has grown tired of fairies and angels, and asks for flesh and blood. . . . We see the beautiful and ugly, and know what the world is and what it ought to be. . . . It is from the realities of life that the highest idealities are born."

Art. 48. Hannigan, D. F.: "The Decline of Romance," *Westminster Review*, CXLI (1894), 33 ff.:

"A marked feature of contemporary literature is the growing antipathy to the unreal and the desire to depict life as it it, without illusion and without exaggeration. . . . [The modern novelist] must possess more extensive, more profound knowledge of life than other men. . . . Fiction, when it is divorced from fact, becomes childish and ridiculous."

Art. 49. Boyesen, H. H.: "The Great Realists and the Empty Story-Tellers," *Forum*, XVIII (1895), 724 ff.: Boyesen quotes Rousseau's statement that the reading of romances had unfitted him for life, and goes on to say that romances are worthless and pernicious; realism, on the other hand, brings to light the truth about moral and psychological matters.

B. Realism as Bad Art

Art. 50. Burroughs, John: "The Real and the Ideal," *Dial*, XIX (1895), 239 ff.: This is an ingratiating essay in which zoology is made to throw light on literary criticism. The bee, says Burroughs, does more than merely gather when he produces honey; he changes the nectar through the addition of substances from his own body. Similarly, the artist can produce no art except by transmuting life through his own thought.

Art. 51. Review of Butcher, S. H.: *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, second edition, 1898, *Edinburgh Review*, CLXXXVIII (1898), 60 ff.: The arraignment

of realism was happily supplemented by a criticism of Zola on Aristotelian principles, given as part of this review of Butcher's well-known book. True, English criticism of the realistic novel had always been more or less Aristotelian, insofar as it had appealed to idealism in character-making; but now the foundation of this appeal was definitely uncovered. The significant passage runs as follows:

"Art, in truth, cannot help idealizing, even if she would. The novels, for example, which are now called 'realistic' or 'naturalistic,' idealize as much as Sophocles does in the character of Antigone, or Shakespeare in the character of Cordelia. But they idealize inversely, they choose the worse, not the better, as the true form of human life—the end at which Nature aims. . . . Art must compose, must select, must disengage the universal; the only question is what should be selected, and what is the universal? If it be granted that the 'universal' is bad, and that the things selected should be disgusting, then the practice of 'naturalism' is in accordance with the principles of Aristotle."

A comment seems needed here, for clearness. The first two statements in the quoted passage are true enough. But from there on the reviewer goes aside from the issue. The realists never had, obviously, any intention of setting up their low-life and despicable characters as ideals of conduct. Aristotle's theorizing applies to a definitely limited type of story-making, with specific ideals which happen to have little or nothing to do with the ideals of realism. The reviewer's error is simply the old one of objecting to an artist's failure to do something which he had no intention of doing anyway.

See also:

Art. 52. Baylor, Frances C.: "A Shield and a Helmet," *Lippincott's Magazine,* XLVIII (1891), 94 ff.

Art. 53. Benson, E. F.: "A Question of Taste," *Nineteenth Century,* XXXIV (1893), 458 ff.

Art. 54. "The Oppressiveness of Modern Novels," in the "Contributor's Club," *Atlantic Monthly,* LXXXV (1900), 716.

Art. 55. Traill, H. D.: "Romance Realisticized," *Contemporary Review,* LIX (1891), 200 ff.

C. Impersonalism

Art. 56. Lee, Vernon: "The Moral Teaching of Zola," *Contemporary Review,* LXIII (1893), 196 ff.: This article is not primarily concerned with realistic theory; but it points out almost on every page Zola's lack of the objectivity which he preached, and on the other hand, his possession of a definite desire to point a moral. Miss Lee perhaps fails to distinguish between objective presentation of an action, and lack of moral conviction about it.

Art. 57. Lepetit, Charles R.: "The Decline and Fall of the Realistic Novel in France," three articles, *Living Age,* CCXXIV (1900), 57 ff., 584 ff., 837 ff.: The series may be summarized thus: I. The popularity of Naturalism was due to enthusiasm for science. Since the limitations of science have been realized, artists have found Naturalism not all-sufficient. II. The Naturalist is limited by his principle in the treatment of psychology and in narrative method. III. The Naturalists were obliged to break with their own logic for the sake of art. The Goncourts became romantic in plot; Zola became an allegorist.

D. The Realism-Idealism Question

Art. 58. Mabie, Hamilton Wright: "The Two Eternal Types in Fiction," *Forum,* XIX (1895), 41 ff.: The two eternal types, of course, are realism and romance, which the author believes are destined to exist side by side as foils to each other. Mabie's preference for romance is scarcely concealed, but this preference seems less definite when we see that he believes "no really great realistic novel has yet appeared in the English language," and places Fielding, Thackeray, and George Eliot among the romanticists.

Art. 59. Review of works by Meredith, Haggard, and Stevenson, *Quarterly Review,* CLXXIII (1891), 468 ff.: The reviewer gives extended consideration to certain works of the above-mentioned authors, introducing once more that most interesting of speculative subjects, the romantic background of realism. About Meredith he says:

> "He is a realist that he may be a philosopher; and he philosophizes to catch reality on the wing, in actual fact, as it is, and not merely as to shut and dreaming eyes it may appear to be, in visions divorced from sunlight truth."

The author finally rejects both scientific realism and the romance of Stevenson and Haggard, preferring the writer

who does what he (the reviewer) represents Meredith as doing—*i.e.*, who searches for the "romance of realism."[9] By this he means, let it be noted, not the search for bizarre or the extraordinary in actual life, but the synthesis, through philosophy, of real experiences into an interpretation.

See also:

Art. 60. Hyde, George Merriam: "The Allotropy of Realism," *Dial*, XVIII (1895), 231 ff.
Art. 61. Pierce, James O.: "New Phases of the Romance," *Dial*, XXVI (1899), 69 ff.
Art. 62. Traill, H. D.: "The New Realism," *Fortnightly Review*, LXVII (1897), 63 ff.

What should be thought of this pageant of criticism? Regardless of whether anything better could have been expected, for one am not able to feel much encouragement over what has actually been exhibited. Even the undoubted worth of some of the articles does not greatly better the impression.

In particular, I see three general weaknesses among these critics of realism. To begin with, they frequently fell into certain irrelevancies or minor arguments which wasted time and energy for them. The objections to the realist's

---

[9]See also Art. 35. The following more recent articles on this subject might be of use to the student of realism:

Waugh, Arthur: "The New Realism," *Fortnightly Review*, CV (1916), 849 ff.
Follett, Wilson: "Sentimentalist, Satirist, and Realist," *Atlantic Monthly*, CXVIII (1916), 490 ff.
Follett, Helen Thomas, and Follett, Wilson: "Contemporary Novelists: Joseph Conrad," *Atlantic Monthly*, CXIX (1917), 233 ff.
Moore, Olin H.: "The Romanticism of Guy de Maupassant," PMLA, XXXIII (1918), 96 ff.
Deutsch, Babette: "The Romance of the Realists," *Dial*, LXVI (1919), 560 ff.
Mavity, Nancy Barr: "A Word about Realism," *Dial*, LXVI (1919), 635 ff.
Taylor, H. W.: "Realism and the Romantic Spirit," *Sewanee Review*, XXXV (1927), 336 ff.
The reader may recall Irving Babbitt's well-known remarks on realism in his *Rosseau and Romanticism* (pp. 104 ff.). Perhaps the most brilliant treatment of the subject is to be found in *Le Romantisme des Réalistes. Gustave Flaubert.* By Ernest Seilliére. Second edition, Paris, 1914.

choice of subject matter are evidently not to the point; for the subject of a work of art is not what gives it character or value. Nor is it any more to the point to take at face value such things as the theory of impersonalism, the experimental theory, and the notion that realism has permanently superseded other kinds of art. We know that realism has never been actually impersonal or experimental; moreover, we may well be amused today at both the arrogance of those who claimed a Messianic function for realism, and the pathos of those who rushed to defend romance. The true value and significance of the realistic novel seem now to have very little to do with all this critical warfare.

A second difficulty among our critics was a lack of progress in opinion. As far as I can see, the general understanding of realism in 1900 was just about what it had been in 1875. Is it unreasonable to expect progress in this matter? Perhaps so, if one thinks how un-Victorian the realism of the Flaubert-Zola type is, hence how much resistance it had to encounter in the Victorian mind. But excusable or not, the fact persists that English criticism did a great deal of floundering and made almost no headway where realism was concerned.

The third difficulty was a general desire to see preserved in fiction not merely idealism in general (a stoutly defended yet slightly vague concept), but the ideal of romantic fiction. Note especially the joy with which some of our critics welcomed the "return of romance" in Stevenson and Rider Haggard. To men in such a frame of mind, realism must of necessity have been hard to comprehend and impossible to accept. The influence of Sir Walter Scott was strong in these days; it has not ceased to be felt in our own time.

To tell the truth, the romance-worshipers were not completely at fault in their excitement over Stevenson and Haggard and such continental romantics as Rostand and Hauptmann. The grip of naturalism was noticeably relaxing by 1890, and at that time and later the return of subjective and fantastic elements in fiction was of great significance. In this return, the revival of early nineteenth century romance

played a considerable and popular part. Yet there were other sorts of subjectivism—the symbolism and mysticism of certain French writers (such as Huysmans), and the beginning of psychological realism—which in the long run have shown far more vitality. The Stevensonian romance and its Continental parallels were pleasant but feeble copies of the old masters. Literature was moving ahead, not back. The inevitable return of subjectivism after the dark days of Zola did not mean the death of realism; it meant a greater flexibility of realistic technique, and an expansion of outlook into regions of human experience that neither Zola nor Flaubert cared about. From the realism of the typical or normal the novel has moved on to the realism of everything-under-the-sun. I am far from saying that English criticism *ought* to have foreseen this movement; I merely remark that their failure actually to *do* so has left them in an unenviable position.

Such, with its occasional brilliant performances, balanced by lapses into stupidity, is the history of realistic theory in the English literary world during the days of the First Empire of realism. One would not learn from these articles, perhaps, much about realism itself; their greatest usefulness is in yielding data to those students of literary history who may want to analyze, not only the triumphs of a great movement, but the groping and fumbling, the inevitable hesitation before what is unfamiliar, the distrust and hatred, that the literary world must always go through with before such triumphs can occur.[10]

---

[10]I have omitted from this paper the interesting subject of the Ibsen controversy, partly because it is already well known, and partly because its issues were at least as much moral and social as they were literary.

The reader will find an excellent supplement to this paper in the form of an article entitled "The English Controversy over Realism in Fiction," by William C. Frierson, in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XLIII (1928), 533 ff.